

income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17459. A bill to amend the war orphans' educational assistance program of title 38, United States Code, to expend to wives of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of a service-connected disability and to widows of veterans who died of a service-connected disability the same educational benefits which are provided for war orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 17460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 17461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17462. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 17463. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 17464. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses undertaken by them in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 17466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1291. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 996. Concurrent resolution to urge negotiation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, article 28, for relief of tariff on machines used in making pulp, paper, and paperboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 994. Resolution to express the sense of the House that the Federal Aviation Agency shall prohibit such aircraft landings as may be found dangerous to the health and safety of residents of surrounding neighborhoods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H. Res. 995. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 996. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 997. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 998. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill S. 774, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H. Res. 999. Resolution to include drum and bugle corps under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

H.R. 17467. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fidilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary, clary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 17468. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Michienzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 17469. A bill for the relief of Alvaro Carlos Carreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 17470. A bill for the relief of Veselin Vucinic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 17471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Taeko (Natale Anthony) Lauritano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17472. A bill for the relief of Sp5c. Joseph H. Barkley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17473. A bill for the relief of Khalil Elias Barchini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 17474. A bill for the relief of Sung-Won-Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 17475. A bill for the relief of Hermine Grigorian, nee Minassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 17476. A bill for the relief of Miss Corazon Chu Cea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1966

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father: For this sacramental moment, closing the doors to a noisy world full of terror and alarm, we

enter this pavilion of quietness and peace, to acknowledge our utter dependence upon Thee—Thou who hast made us in Thy image and for Thyself.

Forgive us for smug satisfaction with ourselves and for our cynical contempt of others. Purge our minds of prejudices out of which we make walls separating us from our fellow man. Cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes to the splendor of spiritual verities—for we know that it is only the pure in heart who can see Thee.

So may we be more worthy to belong to the one great family of Thy children and to take our place at the common table of humanity where the bread of fellowship is broken and the wine of sacrifice is shared.

And Thine shall be the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. NEUBERGER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 30, 1966, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

On request of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LAUSCHE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

INVESTIGATION BY THE PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE OF OUR WORLDWIDE MILITARY COMMITMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, last week the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], commenced its hearing into our worldwide military commitments and our ability to respond to them. The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, was the leadoff witness.

To the Preparedness Subcommittee this is an extremely important and significant inquiry. It represents a careful and determined effort by the legislative branch of the Government to review and measure all of our formal and informal defense commitments and assurances so as to ascertain the degree, if any, that we are overcommitted and overextended all over the world, in the light of our present and potential resources.

Inherent in this problem is the question of whether our free world allies, whose stake in the cause of freedom is as great as ours, are bearing their fair share of the common burden.

Let me commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator STENNIS, for his wisdom and sound judgment in undertaking this timely and important inquiry. It is one which will go far in providing the Congress and the public with those facts which are essential to informed and intelligent judgment about a matter that involves in vital fashion the security of the United States.

In this connection, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point an article by the able newspaperman, Marshall McNeil, "STENNIS Unit To Probe Military Commitments"; an article in the New York Times by the able and respected Arthur Krock, "Issue of U.S. Global Overcommitment"; an editorial from the Columbia, S.C., Record "Where Do We Stand?"; an editorial in the Winston-Salem Journal "Senator STENNIS' Warning"; and an editorial in the Chicago Tribune entitled "Stretched Thin."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 24, 1966]

STENNIS UNIT TO PROBE MILITARY COMMITMENTS

(By Marshall McNeil)

The Senate investigation that starts tomorrow into the extent of our world-wide military commitments, and our ability to respond to them, could have a major impact on future Pentagon plans and budgets.

The inquiry will be conducted by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee headed by Sen. JOHN STENNIS (D., Miss.).

This will be no spur-of-the-moment hearing. The Subcommittee staff—the same group President Johnson headed when he was a senator—started preparing for it last April.

RUSK

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who last February told the Foreign Relations Committee that we have formal commitments

with more than 40 countries to assist them militarily if they are the victims of aggression, will be the first witness.

"These extensive commitments," Sen. STENNIS said, "make it imperative that we take a new and sober look at them and make a hard and realistic appraisal of what level of military effort and response would be required by us if two, three or more contingencies or outbreaks should occur simultaneously."

He said the U.S. could not supply and maintain all the conventional military forces that would be required to meet all our worldwide military commitments at the same time. "Nevertheless," he said, "(we) need an over-all assessment of the extent of our military commitments to enable us to reach a decision as to what level of strength (of our military forces) should be provided within our resources."

When that level of strength is determined and fixed by Congress, Sen. STENNIS said, "it should be supported in all aspects as quickly as possible."

A major significance of the investigation is that these other military commitments exist while we are fighting a war in Viet Nam which soon may require more than 400,000 U.S. servicemen.

MANY YEARS

Sen. STENNIS often has said the war in Viet Nam would last many years, and that even after we win it, the U.S. would be required to keep some of its military there—just as we have in Korea.

As do most senators, Sen. STENNIS believes the costs of the Viet Nam war will continue to spiral, and he expects the Pentagon will ask for another supplemental appropriation, possibly as much as \$10 billion, by early next year.

Sen. STENNIS said Mr. Rusk will be expected to give a broad view of our commitments and to "address himself specifically to NATO and its status and problems."

Subsequently, the chairman added Mr. Rusk will be recalled to testify in a secret session of the Sub-Committee.

The Senator hopes to hold more public hearings, but he warned that because of "security considerations" most of the testimony would have to be taken in executive session.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1966]
IN THE NATION: ISSUE OF U.S. GLOBAL OVER-COMMITMENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 27.—The purpose of a current Senate subcommittee inquiry is to measure against the Administration's policy of going to the aid of all peoples under the threat or presence of external aggression, its capacity to do this and simultaneously care for the economic and military defense requirements of the United States. And it was evident during the questioning of the first witness, Secretary of State Rusk, that no subcommittee member was satisfied with his answers.

Nor was this dissatisfaction allayed by the staged news conference, after a Cabinet meeting later that day, in which Secretary of Defense McNamara let loose a torrent of statistics designed to show that United States' military capability is sufficient to meet any foreseeable strain in carrying out the Administration's global anti-aggression policy.

The questions of the Senate group implied no doubt that this country has the military and economic strength to wage the war in Vietnam without sacrificing any essential requirement of national defense. And there was no suggestion of dissent from what appears to be the position of the large majority of the American people—that the Government is involved in the war in Vietnam to the degree that either withdrawing our

forces entirely, or confining them to defensible enclaves, is wholly out of the question.

SENATORS DISTURBED BY RUSK

But Rusk's interpretation of the anti-aggression commitment as a global obligation from which the use of American armed forces anywhere was not excluded, even in "the absence of a defense treaty, Congressional declaration or United States military presence," clearly disturbed the subcommittee. Also, though the Secretary made a passing reference to Congress as a participating partner with the President in determining whether to use force in each instance of external aggression that might arise elsewhere and carefully qualified "force" with the adjective "collective," committeemen were not impressed, for reasons clear in the record of the wars in Korea and Vietnam. Among these are the following:

(1) President Truman engaged the armed forces of the United States in Korea without seeking the constitutional association of Congress. He based his authority on the commitment assumed by the United States as a signatory of the United Nations Charter, before the U.N., by resolution and at the President's request, imposed the same commitment on its other members. But, though this made the war officially a U.N. "police action," its other members contributed only 5 per cent to the cost and military manpower of the war.

(2) President Kennedy expanded United States involvement in South Vietnam from the handful of military advisers dispatched by President Eisenhower to a strong American military presence in the country. He did this without Congressional affirmation on the basis of actions by Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, which Congress had either directly or indirectly endorsed in going to the aid of nations threatened by Communist aggression.

(3) President Johnson inherited what, once it had been ordered by his predecessor, became a direct and evermounting military involvement of the United States in Vietnam. Mr. Johnson initially did not rely on the SEATO treaty as the source of his authority for whatever expansion of our combat force he would deem necessary. That was a later invention of the Department of State. Mr. Johnson found Congressional authority, for any military decisions he might make, in a resolution passed after an attack by small war-vessels of North Vietnam on two United States destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin.

SUPPORT SOUGHT IN TREATY

It was only when review of the assurances given by Administration spokesmen in the Senate debate showed the resolution had been approved on a much more limited understanding of its scope that the State Department fell back on the SEATO treaty as a blank-check commitment.

But other signatories of the compact have in part accounted for their failure to provide any assistance—military or economic—to the United States in Vietnam by pointing out that there is no such commitment in SEATO, a fact confirmed by the text.

On the basis of this record, it was to be expected that the Senate subcommittee's concern over the nation's global commitments would not be removed by Rusk's ceremonial references to the role of Congress, or by his implication that a sine qua non of the use of United States armed force in redeeming these commitments was that it be a "collective" (allied) undertaking.

The Secretary's exposition of the policy under examination by the subcommittee was actually a literal, militant interpretation of the Truman Doctrine far beyond that made in practice by its author. Though Mr. Truman described the Doctrine as stating an unqualified obligation by the United States to go to the aid of "any peoples threatened by

external aggression or internal subversion," he invoked it on the limited basis of economic and technical assistance until the attack on South Korea from the Communist North. And even then he gave the United States military intervention the semblance (as it proved) of "collective" action by enveloping it with the Charter and the flag of the U.N.

U.N. IMPOSED RESTRAINTS

In the final analysis this tactic of President Truman provided the U.N. with the authority to impose the restraints on the U.S. armed forces that prevented this nation for the first time in its history to carry a war to a conclusion. And important sources of the restraint were our allies in the Security Council, despite their small contribution in Korea.

In view of this background, of the 40 military commitments of the United States abroad and of the hollow ring which experience has given to the word "collective," the subcommittee merely indicated a wide public uneasiness about the Administration's global anti-aggression concept. Particularly since its choice of a testing-ground has proved so fallible that, as Chairman STENNIS remarked: "A relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Vietnam has been able to tie us down."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Aug. 28, 1966]

WHERE DO WE STAND?

The question of how well the United States is prepared for war which would be superimposed upon that in which we are already engaged in Southeast Asia is indeed a vital one, and one which has been forcefully raised in the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

Perhaps the nuclear power of our country and of Russia is a sufficient deterrent to general war, and perhaps for other reasons no such war is in prospect. And perhaps no more smaller conflicts are in the cards. The people of America so hope.

But it is right that Congress propound the question to the State and Defense Departments, as Senator STENNIS, chairman of the subcommittee, has done. It is the kind of watchfulness for which this committee was created.

There was a response from the Administration so immediate as to suggest a feeling of urgency on the part of the White House. Secretary McNamara sought to show that despite the extent of our current commitments around the globe we are fully able to meet them.

But the basis of Senator STENNIS' question remained unanswered. He has said his committee wanted to know "whether or not we are, or may be, over-extended either now or in the future." He had posed the question of what would be our capacity if two or three other Viet Nams should develop. What, especially, would be our resource in manpower?

It would be comforting to conclude that the only task before us is that of prevailing in Viet Nam, but the subcommittee properly asks if we are sufficiently secure in Europe and what are the "realistic assessments" of the future with respect to our whole current obligation and possible additional demands.

These are indeed hard and searching questions, including difficult looks ahead, but lest there be a slumbering along the line and an over-emphasis of the goal in Southeast Asia, they should be asked recurrently and firmly.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Aug. 27, 1966]

SENATOR STENNIS' WARNING

Of all the anxieties that the war in Viet Nam has generated, none is more persistent or more critical than that raised again this

week by Senator JOHN STENNIS of Mississippi: Has the war distorted our commitment and left us in a weakened condition elsewhere?

Secretary Rusk insisted that the war has had no such effect. And Secretary McNamara made what was the only reasonable comment a Secretary of Defense could make in a public hearing. "We are," he said, "better prepared today to fulfill our worldwide commitments than at any time in recent years."

But Senator STENNIS' question is serious, and it cannot be laid to rest, as he said by "rosy generalizations." As he said, "the hard fact is that a relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Viet Nam has been able to tie us down and require a very substantial commitment of our military manpower and resources over many months." It is no more than realism to insist that this danger exists and that we ought to be concerned, as Senator STENNIS is, about it.

The news of the day is not reassuring either. The American contingent in Viet Nam has now risen to more than 300,000 men. Congress has closed the door on a selective tapping of the manpower pool that the Reserves provide. Draftees are finding their way to Viet Nam in very short order these days. The dollar cost of the war is rising and is having a distressing effect on the nation's economy.

The defense of South Viet Nam and the attempt to stabilize Southeast Asia have seemed to us logical and reasonable and honorable things for the United States to undertake. And certainly our intervention has denied the Communists almost sure success in Viet Nam.

The war, however, must be kept in some overall perspective. If the American commitment does rise, as many people have predicted it will, to 600,000 or 750,000 men, what will happen to our national commitments elsewhere then? Are there enough men to supply the needs? Is the Administration facing up to the tough political decisions that would keep our military strength at adequate levels? And most fundamentally, is it really in the national interest to expand the war to such dimensions and to devote so large a share of our resources to this war?

Such questions have emerged at each stage of the war, as it increased in intensity, but they will become more acute now. The strain of the war on the national economy is becoming heavier now. And it is easy to see that the strain on our capacity to meet our responsibilities elsewhere is growing commensurately.

Senator STENNIS has been an accurate prophet thus far of the costs and risks of this war. His warning now deserves a more specific and more convincing answer from the national administration.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Aug. 26, 1966]

STRETCHED THIN

The Senate preparedness subcommittee yesterday provided the useful reminder to the American people that our global commitments, pledging us to the defense of more than 40 countries, have stretched our military strength very thin. Sen. STENNIS, the chairman, said the hearings were intended to explore "whether or not we may be over-extended either now or in the future."

Secretary of State Rusk, the lead-off witness, said, yes, we are committed by treaty to more than 40 countries on five continents, but that we weren't posing as the "world's policeman" and that we weren't seeking to impose a "pax Americana" on the globe.

"These commitments," he said, "do not increase the likelihood that we will have to fight. Rather, by making clear in advance our estimation of the requirements of national security, they reduce that likelihood."

He added that no prospective troublemaker should jump to the conclusion that in the absence of a defense treaty or other commitment the United States would not necessarily come to the defense of a country which had come under attack. On that basis, we apparently have taken every non-communist country in the world under our wing; yet Mr. Rusk says we aren't to be considered a global policeman.

Sen. STENNIS did not sound persuaded. He pointed out that a relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Viet Nam has been able to tie us down and require a very substantial commitment of our military manpower and resources over many months.

With so many military commitments, he said, the United States could not afford to become overly preoccupied with one area of the world. The question in his mind, he said, was how we could expect to respond if brush fire wars broke out at a number of places at once. That, as we mention elsewhere on this page, is the strategy outlined by Red China's defense minister, Lin Biao, who sees the United States nibbled to death in "people's wars."

We do not expect that the Senate committee can arrive at a definitive answer to its questions. The fact, however, is that the United States has entered so many defense treaties that probably few citizens can keep track of them. There are NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, and the Rio pact with 19 Latin American countries. There are separate arrangements with countries ranging from Nationalist China, Japan, and Korea to Liberia.

All of these commitments have been assumed without consideration of the factor of equality of risk and sacrifice. How many of these so-called allies could give us real help in a showdown? Most of them refuse to respect our trade embargo on communist Cuba. A large number of them trade with our enemy, communist North Viet Nam. Some of them sell wheat to communist China, or arrange to build steel mills for the Red Chinese. In Korea, for what in theory was a United Nations war, the United States provided about 95 percent of the fighting power, aside from the troops of South Korea, and it also paid almost all of the cost. In Viet Nam, with the exception of some Koreans and Australians, we fight alone.

The questions voiced by the Stennis committee are very real ones. We are stretched very thin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, as a member of the subcommittee from this side of the aisle, I want to join the Senator from Missouri. I believe the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has endeavored to have the committee really understand and be advised of the preparedness conditions of our military strength throughout the world. Certainly, discussion of our overall commitments will be very helpful to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his approval. He is the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee in question.

DEATH OF ANDREW EDMISTON, FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM WEST VIRGINIA—LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, the Honorable Andrew Edmiston, former Member of the House of Representatives

from West Virginia, has died at his home in Weston in our State of West Virginia. My wife joins me in expressing condolences to his widow, Beth, and his daughter, Ann.

He had a very distinguished record of service for the people of the congressional district which he represented for four terms and also for the citizenry of the country he loved.

Andrew Edmiston was the manager of my campaign when I ran in my first primary for office in the Senate, in 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence for this afternoon to attend funeral services in West Virginia for my cherished friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I have a resolution at the desk, which I ask to have read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 300), as follows:

Whereas the foreign policy and military strength of the United States are dedicated to the protection of our national security, the preservation of the liberties of the American people, and the maintenance of world peace; and

Whereas the United States in implementing these principles has maintained large contingents of American Armed Forces in Europe, together with air and naval units for twenty years; and

Whereas the security of the United States and its citizens remains interwoven with the security of other nations signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty as it was when the treaty was signed but the condition of our European allies, both economically and militarily, have appreciably improved since large contingents of forces were deployed; and

Whereas the means and capacity of all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to provide forces to resist aggression has significantly improved since the original United States deployment; and

Whereas the commitment by all members of the North Atlantic Treaty is based upon the full cooperation of all treaty partners in contributing materials and men on a fair and equitable basis but such contributions have not been forthcoming from all other members of the organization; and

Whereas relations between Eastern Europe and Western Europe were tense when the large contingents of U.S. forces were deployed in Europe but this situation has now undergone substantial change and relations between the two parts of Europe are now characterized by an increasing two-way flow of trade, people and other peaceful exchange; and

Whereas the present policy of maintaining large contingents of U.S. forces and their dependents on the European continent also contributes further to the fiscal and monetary problems of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That—

1. It is the sense of the Senate that, with changes and improvements in the techniques of modern warfare and because of the vast increase in capacity of the United States to wage war and to move military forces and equipment by air, a substantial reduction of U.S. forces permanently stationed in Europe can be made without adversely affecting either our resolve or ability to meet our commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty;

2. Senate Resolution 99, adopted in the Senate April 4, 1951, is amended to contain the provisions of this resolution and, where the resolution may conflict, the present resolution is controlling as to the sense of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the resolution just read is cosponsored by the entire membership of the majority policy committee—Senators LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, HILL, RICHARD RUSSELL, HAYDEN, MAGNUSON, PASTORE, SYMINGTON, MUSKIE, HART, BREWSTER, and INOUYE. It is intended to express to the President the sentiment of the Senate that there be a substantial reduction in the U.S. forces stationed in Western Europe. The Senate will recall that recent unofficial counts put these forces somewhere between 400,000 and 450,000 and, together with dependents, the total is between 900,000 and 1 million Americans—military personnel and families—stationed and supported in Europe.

The Senate should be cognizant of the circumstances which have led to the introduction of the proposed resolution. Consideration of the question began in a wholly spontaneous fashion at the July 13 session of the committee. The question of troop deployment in Europe was raised in connection with a general discussion of the international position of the Nation. It became at once the focus of the proceedings and in the end, the membership, by unanimous agreement, directed the chairman to advise the President of the committee's deep concern over what appeared to be an excessive and unchanging departmental deployment of ground troops in Western Europe.

Accordingly on July 14, the President was notified by letter. His response was immediate and helpful. He made available to the committee for further expert consideration of the question, Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Treasury Fowler. The meeting with these Cabinet officers was held on July 18 at the Department of State. As a further contribution to the committee's study of the question, the administration sent Ambassador George McGee, who had just returned from Germany, to meet with the group on July 22. On July 20, August 10, 25 and 30, the committee convened in camera for its own consideration of the question. In all, there were seven meetings of the Democratic Policy Committee at which the subject of U.S. forces in Europe was the principal or sole item of discussion.

The proceedings of these meetings, heretofore, have been held in confidence pending some decision as to the action which should be taken on the basis of the deliberations. Reference is made to them

now, as background for the presentation of this resolution. The depth of interest which is manifested by them is relevant and the record should be clear as to the extent of the consideration of the matter. The resolution which has been sent to the desk represents the most considered and sober judgment of the cosponsors. They recommend, most respectfully to the President and the executive branch, a course of action with regard to U.S. troop deployment in Europe which the cosponsors are persuaded ought to be taken in the interests of the Nation.

The decision of Members to present their judgment in this form was influenced by an earlier action of the Senate. In April 1951, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 99—82d Congress—which expressed the sense of the Senate that the United States should deploy an additional four military divisions in Europe to serve with the equivalent of two other divisions which were already there. The resolution of 1951 was welcomed by President Truman and the executive branch at that time as an appropriate expression of Senate sentiment during a critical period in relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Fifteen years later, it is the considered view of the cosponsors of this resolution that the Senate should express its sense that the deployment of U.S. forces should be reduced substantially with the expectation that the executive branch will again welcome the sentiment of the Senate on this matter.

We are persuaded that that conclusion by many significant and relevant changes which have occurred—both in Europe and at home—since 1951. The sum of these changes, in our judgment, has indicated for some time the desirability of a reduction of the U.S. force totals in Europe. Yet the Senate still rests on the official advice which it gave to the President in 1951. It still holds to the position, in effect, that six U.S. divisions should be stationed in Europe. The time has come, in the judgment of the cosponsors of the pending resolution, to alter that advice which was given to the President in 1951, to bring it up to date.

Western Europe has long since rehabilitated itself after the devastation of World War II. It is now a thriving and dynamic region of greatly expanded economic and political, and potential military, capacity. That factor alone, in my judgment, would justify a revision of the 15-year-old level of deployment whereby the greatest share of Western Europe's defense is borne by the United States as though the former were still war weakened, exhausted, and incapable of an equitable defense effort of its own.

There are other considerations which point in the same direction. The fact is that NATO allies have recognized a significant change in the earlier East-West European confrontation which apparently justifies in their eyes a reduced emphasis on defense. Certainly, the sizes of their troop deployments to the NATO Command are remote from the estimates which they originally accepted as necessary. That strongly suggests a changed view of Eastern Europe. In this connection, moreover, it should be noted that relationships, as between Western

Europe and Eastern Europe have, in fact, altered for the better in these last 15 years. The channels of trade, communication, diplomacy and other exchanges have been improved and enlarged. There is an obvious lessening of tensions as compared with 1951.

There is no question that this trend has had a strong influence on the attitude of the Western European countries toward their NATO commitments. Indeed, in the case of France, it has led even to an insistence that there be a withdrawal of forces which are stationed there as part of NATO.

Finally, I should note that the maintenance of the present level of U.S. forces in Europe is very costly both in tax dollars and in dollar exchange to the people of the United States. Of course, if it were vital to the security of the Nation and to the preservation of world peace, we would find, in one way or another, the financial resources to keep 6 or 16 divisions in Europe. But when the indications are that the U.S. military establishment in Western Europe is excessive to need, when the attitudes and actions of our Western European allies confirm the conclusion that reductions can be made in the great contingent of American military forces and dependents, then it is wholly unwarranted to sustain an unnecessary dollar and dollar-exchange drain. Over-expenditures of this kind by Government departments are always undesirable. And they are especially undesirable at a time of balance-of-payments difficulties and enormous and growing military costs.

I wish to stress, Madam President, that no partisanship of any kind, shape of form, attaches to the fact that the proposed resolution originated among the members of the Democratic policy committee. The fact is, as it is well known, that many Senators have recognized for some time the desirability of reduction of U.S. forces in Europe. This recognition, may I add, exists on both sides of the aisle. It will be recalled, moreover, that President Eisenhower has strongly advocated a lowering of U.S. force levels in Europe, and I am frank to say, Madam President, that Mr. Eisenhower's advocacy figured prominently in the deliberations of the members of the Democratic policy committee.

To make the point of nonpartisanship very clear, Madam President, I would emphasize that I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader, and, as usual, he is understanding of what is involved. Furthermore, in actual procedural status before the Senate, the proffered resolution is one which is cosponsored by individual Members of the Senate who also happen to be members of the majority policy committee. And in this connection, I ask that the resolution be held at the desk until midnight September 6, so that other Senators of both parties may cosponsor if they so desire and that it then be placed on the calendar. Finally, Madam President, I ask that the resolution go directly to the calendar under rule 14. I have discussed this matter with the chairman of

the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. Fulbright] and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. Russell]. While the question at issue is deeply intertwined with the specialization of both committees, they are agreed that the issue is sufficiently clear and of an urgency that warrants its prompt and direct consideration by the Senate as a whole.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, this suggested resolution is of extreme and critical importance in its implications, and very far reaching. It does seem to me that the resolution should be referred by the Chair to an appropriate committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I would inform the distinguished minority whip that this resolution is a sense resolution. It will go to the calendar regardless, if I ask for its consideration and objections is heard. The question is where we want it, either in the back part of the calendar or the first part.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, let me inquire, then, what happens to a sense-of-the-Senate resolution under the rules. Is there no opportunity for an appropriate committee to hold hearings on the matter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. After it is called up. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If its immediate consideration is asked for and an objection is heard, then it goes over under the rule and will be printed on that part of the printed calendar entitled "Resolutions and Motions Over, Under the Rule." Under the rules, all bills and resolutions are referred to committees unless some other procedure is requested and granted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator objects after I ask for its consideration, would it not go to the calendar regardless? I ask the Presiding Officer if that is not a correct statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If objection is heard to its consideration now, it will go over under the rule and be printed on the calendar at the proper place.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have the most profound respect for the majority leader. But I must say that this proposed resolution is exceedingly serious in its implications. Before any Senator passes judgment on it, he should have the benefit of views of those whose responsibility it is to sit in judgment on problems of American defense and foreign affairs. If the resolution goes on the calendar now, there will not be one individual from the executive branch who will be permitted to come forward and testify.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, may I say—and I think I am correct in this statement—that once this resolution is called up, a motion can be made to refer it to a committee or committees.

Mr. KUCHEL. What are my rights, Madam President? Do I have a right to object; and, if I do, does the resolution go on the calendar?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has a right to object, of course.

Mr. KUCHEL. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California may object to its consideration. Does the Senator object?

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, do I correctly understand that I have a right to object to its consideration?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I object to its consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I asked that the resolution be held at the desk until midnight, September 6, at the suggestion of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, without reference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, of course, I have no objection to having the resolution lie on the desk for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, the resolution will lie on the desk until midnight, September 6, without reference at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. Fulbright] and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. Russell]. While the question at issue is deeply intertwined with the specialization of both committees, they are agreed that the issue is sufficiently clear and of an urgency that warrants its prompt and direct consideration by the Senate as a whole.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a study on "U.S. Troop Commitments to Europe Since World War II" be inserted in the RECORD. This is an excellent bit of research and I commend Roselyn K. Wahner for a job well done. This study was compiled at my request and I call attention to the first paragraph in the research paper.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1966.
To: Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.
From: Foreign Affairs Division
Subject: U.S. Troop Commitments to Europe Since World War II.

The Department of Defense has had a general policy from which it has deviated in only a few cases, since the end of World War II, of not releasing figures for United States force levels in the European area. In the absence of official information, the estimates were compiled from nonofficial sources.

The end of World War II found the United States armed forces deployed generally in two main areas: Western Europe and the Western Pacific. In accordance with the demobilization of troops both at home and abroad, however, by 1949 the United States troops in Europe totaled only about 1½ to 2 divisions, most of these serving as occupation forces in West Germany. "In Europe, for example, the American forces were soon reduced to the point where their military effectiveness was practically nil."¹

¹ John Campbell, et al., *The United States in World Affairs, 1945-1947* (New York, Published for the Council on Foreign Relations by Harper & Brothers, 1947), p. 33.

Although the North Atlantic Treaty was signed on April 4, 1949, no substantial move was made toward increasing troop strength in Western Europe until the outbreak of the Korean War a little more than a year later (June 25, 1950), which shocked the members of the alliance into the realization of the necessity of rearming. In September 1950, President Harry Truman announced the approval of "substantial increases in the strength of United States forces to be stationed in Western Europe in the interest of the defense of that area."² Major moves by the United States to stimulate allied rearmament were the appointment of General Dwight David Eisenhower as Supreme Commander of NATO forces in Europe and the placement of four more American divisions (making a total of almost six) on the forward line in Western Germany.³ In February 1951 Secretary of Defense Marshall announced that four U.S. divisions would soon join the forces already stationed in West Germany, thus according to Lord Ismay bringing the total of American forces in Europe in 1952 to 400,000 men.⁴ *The United States in World Affairs, 1951*, cites a smaller figure: "... American forces in Europe by the middle of 1952 were actually scheduled to number 344,000, including 284,000 ground and 60,000 air personnel."⁵

Since 1951, the number of American ground forces on the continent has remained about the same despite changes in American strategic thinking and in Europe's political and economic conditions.⁶

In 1960 the Council on Foreign Relations in the "United States in World Affairs," noted that:

"The progressive shift from conventional to nuclear weapons, and from aircraft to missiles, had revolutionized the bases of military strategy and was widely felt to require a fundamental rethinking of the military problems involved in defending the North Atlantic area. In many minds it had raised a question as to whether the United States might not eventually decide to withdraw the substantial forces it had been maintaining on the European Continent—currently reckoned at 5 divisions and 3 armored units—and rely primarily on its home-based and seaborne missiles. . . . Despite signs of uneasiness in Washington about the increased balance of payments deficit and the large expenditures involved in keeping its forces overseas, such a move did not appear by any means imminent in early 1960."⁷

The figure of five-six divisions, representing five organized divisions plus units approximately equivalent to another division, generally represents American troop commitments except for temporary increases provoked by crises such as the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961. Estimates vary as to the total number of American military men sent at that time. "The United States in World Affairs, 1961," noted that up to the middle of September 1961, the United States government had made various declarations of

intention but had effected comparatively "little concrete action to build up the alliance's conventional and ground strength."⁸ "The United States, after initially announcing plans to send another 3,000 men to Europe, indicated in early September that these would be part of a total increment of some 40,000," thus raising the total American commitment to about 290,000.⁹ By late 1961, however, the United States was completing the move of some 50,000 Army personnel to Europe, bringing total Army strength to 280,000, and the entire commitment in the European theatre to nearly 400,000 men.¹⁰

Henson Baldwin, military specialist of the New York Times later wrote on August 6, 1963, that U.S. troop strength in Europe was being "gradually levelled off from the 275,000 peak it reached in the Berlin crisis in 1961 to between 232,000 and 235,000 men." He estimated that before the Berlin crisis American strength had been about 228,000. His assessment of total American commitment in Europe was between 352,000 and 362,000 men, evidently including Army, Navy, and Air Force contingents.¹¹

In December 1963 President Lyndon B. Johnson pledged to the North Atlantic Council that the United States would "keep in Europe the equivalent of six American divisions that are now deployed there, so long as they are needed."¹² He further assured the alliance that certain additional combat units sent to Germany as temporary reinforcements in 1961 would also be kept there as long as needed; and that while plans had been made for some reductions in U.S. non-combat personnel, no withdrawals which could impair the military effectiveness of our forces in Germany had been foreseen.¹³

Estimates of present American defense commitments in Europe vary, by source and according to the Branches of the Service included in the estimate, a point not always made clear by the source. For example, some sources include the ground troops in Europe, the men in the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, and those in the 17th Air Force; others refer only to the Army in West Germany. Still others refer only to the NATO commitment; others include troops in Spain, not a member of the Alliance. The Division is enclosing a memorandum by Thomas C. Lyons, Jr., Analyst in Military Affairs, June 7, 1966, which indicates the difficulty of arriving at precise statistics. As you will note on page 2 of the Lyons memorandum, 1966 estimates vary from 450,000 troops in Europe, including five combat divisions plus Air Force and U.S. Sixth Fleet,¹⁴ to the Washington Post February 10, 1966, estimate of 340,000 men in the "European Area," including 240,000 ground troops, plus Air Force and Navy.

The Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, has given the most recent reliable figures on the size of the U.S. Army forces in Europe. In hearings before the subcommittee on National Security and International Operations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, June 21, 1966, he stated that the "U.S. Army, Europe, contained approximately 225,000 military personnel at the end of last year," with a temporary reduction of personnel by about 15,000 to be built

up to the previous level of 225,000 by December, 1966.¹⁵

In December, 1965, Max Frankel of the New York Times reported that about 400,000 U.S. servicemen were stationed in Europe.¹⁶

Estimates as to the breakdown often vary greatly, e.g. figures given by Jeanne Kuebler in July 20, 1966, Editorial Research Reports and those given by the Christian Science Monitor, March 11, 1966, p. 1:

U.S. Army in West Germany—210,000 (McNamara, Kuebler).

U.S. forces in West Berlin—5,000 (Kuebler).

U.S. forces in France—26,000 (New York Times, March 11, 1966) to 30,000 (Christian Science Monitor, hereafter CSM), to 34,000 (Kuebler, "before withdrawal began June 30," 1966).

U.S. forces in Britain—20,000 (CSM) to 30,000 (Kuebler).

U.S. forces in Spain—8,000 (CSM) to 10,000 (Kuebler).

U.S. forces in Italy—4,500 (Kuebler) to 10,000 (CSM). Division estimates closer to 8,000.

U.S. forces in Iceland—4,000 (Kuebler). Division estimates closer to 3,000.

U.S. forces in Turkey—1,900 (Kuebler) to 8,000 (CSM).

Greece—2,000 (CSM).

Netherlands—1,000 (CSM).

Presumably the above figures include Army forces and about 56,000 Air Force personnel. In addition, one must include the Navy and Marine personnel assigned to the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. Estimates as to its strength vary from 26,000 (Kuebler) to 35,000 (Division estimate, compiled from various press reports). Hence, on the basis of unofficial sources, the Division can offer only the very rough estimate that present American forces in Europe total 350,000 to 400,000.

ROSELYN K. WAHNER.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I also ask that a UPI story for August 31 covering Defense Department figures be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Defense Department figures indicate that U.S. forces stationed in Europe total approximately 330,000 men.

This would include more than 200,000 Army troops in Western Europe, and nearly 25,000 in the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

In addition, an unstated number of men would always be in transit between assignments in the United States and Europe. From time to time, units stationed in the United States are assigned to temporary duty in Europe.

The Army in Western Europe was reduced by withdrawals for Vietnam from 225,000 to around 210,000 during the year ended July 1.

It is now increasing again, and is scheduled to be back at 225,000 by December 31.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, does not the distinguished Senator

² Robert E. Osgood, *NATO: The Entangling Alliance* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 71.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁴ Lord Ismay, Secretary-General of NATO. *NATO: the first five years, 1949-1954*, p. 40.

⁵ Testimony of General J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, July 31, reported in the *New York Times*, August 1, 1951, cited in Richard P. Stebbins, et al., *The United States in World Affairs, 1951* (New York, Published by the Council on Foreign Relations by Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 55.

⁶ Jeanne Kuebler, "American Forces in Europe," Editorial Research Reports, 1966, vol. II, July 20, 1966: 537.

⁷ *The United States in World Affairs, 1960*, p. 113.

⁸ *The United States in World Affairs, 1961*, p. 146.

⁹ *U.S. in World Affairs, 1961*, p. 146, italics added.

¹⁰ *U.S. in World Affairs, 1962*, p. 131. Italics added.

¹¹ Hanson Baldwin, *New York Times*, August 6, 1963.

¹² Jeanne Kuebler, "American Troops Abroad," *Editorial Research Reports*, 1964, vol. 1, January 15, 1964, p. 23.

¹³ *U.S. in World Affairs, 1963*, p. 121.

¹⁴ *U.S. News and World Report*, January 3, 1966.

¹⁵ Hearings before Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, U.S. Senate, June 21, 1966, pp. 193-194. Army, Europe, means Seventh Army, West Germany.

¹⁶ Max Frankel, *New York Times*, December 5, 1965.

from California feel this matter could be thoroughly debated on the floor of the Senate without going to a joint committee of Armed Services and Foreign Relations, in which case there would be many witnesses, and possibly extended delay in expressing the sense of the Senate?

The able majority leader has summed up our position. In effect, there is no more to say, as the result of his typically careful and thorough remarks.

I do not often disagree with my friend, the able Senator from California, but cannot see his point in considering holding up this matter for hearings of that kind.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, no one respects my friend, the Senator from Missouri, more than I. I know his wisdom and experience. Some Senators have not had that kind of experience and background. Speaking for myself, I should like to have the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff come before a committee and be cross-examined on the subject matter embodied in this resolution. That is the normal procedure.

Madam President, this is a serious question. I believe it would be far better for me to arrive at a judgment on this far-reaching resolution if each of us had a printed record available with the cross-examination of those whose responsibility, in the executive branch, it is to deal with this type of problem.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield briefly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In further reply to the Senator from California, one of the members of the committee that present this resolution is not only the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services but also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations.

This matter was gone into at length in hearings with the Secretary of Defense. They were joint hearings of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. Members of both parties fully participated.

The Senator can obtain the record of those hearings, already printed, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, the Senator from California is not precluded at any time, indeed at any moment, once the sense resolution is on the calendar, to move that it be referred to any committee he desires.

Mr. KUCHEL. I understand that is what the Acting President pro tempore indicated. It is also true that under the Senate rules, it would automatically be referred to a committee.

Mr. PASTORE. With respect to interrogating and cross-examining the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, it must be borne in mind that, as the majority leader has pointed out, we have had meeting after meeting. I realize that this does not satisfy the curiosity of the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not a matter of curiosity. It is a matter of discharging my duty as a U.S. Senator on a subject of great importance. You—some of you—may have had your meetings, but most of us have not met with the Secretaries of Defense and State on this matter.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct—the curiosity of his responsibility. Let us put it in that way.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is a rather peculiar phrase. I simply want all Senators to have the benefit of expert testimony before voting on as far reaching a resolution as this.

Mr. PASTORE. I refer to the Senator's desire that each individual Senator have the benefit of the views of Defense authorities—the curiosity born of his sense of responsibility—to query them personally. The fact of the matter is that there has been no frivolous action taken here by the responsible people involved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, the action of the members of the committee or the cosponsors of the resolution has not been frivolous in any measure. It is the product of responsible discussion.

We must remember here that by the sense resolution that was passed in 1951, the United States of America made a commitment—and is the only member of the alliance that has met its commitment 100 percent. I repeat no other member of the alliance has met that commitment. The situation has reached a point now that the Members of the Senate, after having discussed this on the floor of the Senate many times, are beginning to wonder whether we are not adopting a double standard in Europe. When we speak of trade, there seems to be a detente. When we speak of withdrawing our troops, there always seems to be an entente. We have been disturbed by this matter for a long period of time.

If all of the nations of this alliance had met their commitment 100 percent, I think a great deal could be said here in argument, especially for the point of view expressed by the Senator from California.

The only nation of the alliance that has come up to 80 percent of its commitment has been West Germany.

We feel that, because of modern armament and the improvement of our weaponry today, that the power that is maintained in Europe on the part of the United States of America is equivalent to the power that we offered in 1951. For that reason, I do not see any reason why a substantial number of troops cannot be withdrawn and at the same time continue to guarantee the

security not only of Europe, but also of the free world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I make this statement as a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services on this side of the aisle.

The chairman of our committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], courteously informed me of this resolution that was going to be offered by the majority leader this morning. He told me that it was the result of the unanimous opinion of the policy committee.

I discussed it briefly with him yesterday afternoon. I discussed it again with the majority leader this morning.

It is my understanding that this resolution is to lie on the desk until midnight, September 6, for the cosponsorship of any other Senators who want to join in it.

It is my understanding from a discussion with the majority leader that he does not intend to bring this resolution before the Senate for at least several days after the Senate reconvenes on September 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the senior Senator from Massachusetts will defer to the Chair, the Chair should like to restate the request of the Senator from Montana for the purpose of clarification. The request is that the resolution is to be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until after midnight, September 6, without reference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, obviously no reasonable person would object to holding a resolution or bill at the desk for cosponsors. I would not do that.

My question, therefore, is, when there is no objection registered—as there will not be to what has just been said—then, at the end of that time that bill is held at the desk, does the problem arise whether it is to be referred to a committee?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be automatically referred unless some other request is made and granted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Under the rules?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be automatically referred under the rules, unless there is some special request for some other disposition made and granted.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no objection to the request as it has just been stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, as I started to state, it is my understanding that this resolution will lie on the desk until midnight September 6, without reference, for additional cosponsors.

The majority leader has stated to me personally—and I believe he will so state

on the floor, if it is asked of him—that the subject will not come up for consideration until some time after that—3 or 4 days, or perhaps even a week.

At that time, the question of whether the matter should be debated on the floor, or automatically referred if objection is made, can come up.

I agree with the majority leader, with the policy committee, and with the statement of the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL], that this is a subject of great importance to our security, to our safety, and to the peace of the world.

As I read the resolution and the statement of the majority leader, it does not attempt to usurp the prerogatives of the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief. The resolution attempts to express the sense of the Senate as to a reduction of our forces in Europe.

As I stated to the chairman of my committee yesterday, this subject involves our own security and safety. It involves the policies of NATO. It involves the United Nations. It may even involve the activities in the Far East.

So it is a matter of great importance, and a very serious matter, as the Senator from California has brought up. We certainly can discuss it between now and when the majority leader wants to bring it up, and the majority leader, in his usual generous way, has said that it will not be brought up until Members have had a chance to discuss it with him in committees or elsewhere.

It is my understanding that we will not get into a discussion of this subject this morning. I shall not attempt to give my views on it, because I have not considered it carefully. I hope that the majority leader will give us ample opportunity, after Labor Day, when we return, to decide how best to handle this matter in the best interests of the security and safety of our country and the security of the world.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Before I yield to the distinguished Senator from California, I should like to make this statement. On the 6th of September I will ask for immediate consideration of the resolution. On an objection which will be lodged, the resolution then will go on the Calendar, under rule XIV. Am I correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So it will reach the calendar, regardless.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has said September 6. It should be September 7, because the resolution will lie on the table until midnight September 6.

Mr. MANSFIELD. September 7 is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry. I think this inquiry is important because of the question raised by the Senator from California.

Madam President, on September 6, will this resolution automatically be referred to committee, and to prevent that, will

it be necessary for the majority leader to make a motion that it go to the calendar?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the request, the resolution will be held at the desk until midnight September 6, for additional cosponsors, without reference. Then, if no other disposition is made of it on September 7, the resolution will be referred.

Mr. KUCHEL. To a committee?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. But if, as the Senator from Montana has stated, there is a request for immediate consideration of the resolution, it will go over, under the rule.

Mr. MORSE. That is my parliamentary inquiry. On September 7, it will be necessary for the majority leader, or someone else, to move that the resolution go to the calendar and be considered by the Senate. Do I understand correctly?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If objection is heard to its immediate consideration, then it goes over, under rule XIV. It will be listed in the place provided in the calendar for resolutions and motions over, under the rule.

Mr. MORSE. I have one more parliamentary inquiry. Will it then be necessary, in order to have it referred to a committee—and I would vote against referring it to a committee—to have the Senate take official referral action on the resolution sending it to a committee?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If it goes over under the rule, on the following legislative day, after the transaction of routine morning business, the resolution would automatically be placed before the Senate by the Chair, at which time it would be debatable until 2 o'clock; and then, if not disposed of, it would go on the calendar. Then a motion to refer would be in order after the resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I yield to the distinguished assistant majority leader, may I say that it is not my intention to consider this bill on the 7th as Senate business, but merely to have it placed on the calendar, to have it called up on an appropriate date, after the Senate has had a chance to look into it and to find out what it is all about.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I believe that it should be noted—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time requested has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask recognition in my own right.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a request to change the order of business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the limitation on debate on H.R. 14929 be moved forward to 11:15, and that I may be allowed a few minutes to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Reserving the right to object to that request, may I ask that the majority leader make it 20 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. All right.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. For 20 minutes. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The resolution offered by the majority leader was

not considered lightly. This matter has been discussed in the Committee on Foreign Relations off and on for a period of many years. I am not aware that one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations believes that we are justified in maintaining a million Americans on European soil.

This matter has been discussed by members of the Democratic policy committee many times. I doubt that the chairman of any committee to whom this resolution could conceivably be referred would differ on this matter.

It was suggested that perhaps there should be a limitation on an appropriation bill, in order to require that some of these troops be brought home.

It was suggested that perhaps there should be a limitation on an appropriation bill in order to require that some of these troops be brought home. The Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Forces, and Finance were also mentioned because of their relevant jurisdictions, but some of us felt that we had heard the views of the executive branch and it was time that we quit listening to them and, for a change, tell them what we think.

We should keep in mind that France has asked the troops on French soil to get out. Some of us were disappointed to find that when France asked those troops to leave, instead of bringing them home, our Nation proposed to move them into some other European country.

It will cost a great deal of money to build troop housing and family housing, and to provide schools for children and dependents, when we have so many more troops over there than we can justify.

My guess is that this one item is responsible for several billion dollars annually of our unfavorable balance of payments.

The resolution simply proposes that we say, as a body, what most Senators have been saying individually for quite a while that they think we have too many troops and too many dependents over there; that we are spending too much money over there; that, all things considered, we would be justified in making a very substantial reduction, and that it would be in the national interest.

I have been raising this point for several years, and I am pleased that the majority leader felt the time had come to do something about it, and that the Democratic policy committee studied the matter and acted unanimously. We talked to the Secretary of State and to our Ambassador to Germany—a very fine gentleman. We heard everybody's point of view, those in the executive branch take one view and we take the other. They did not convince us, and we did not convince them.

Now we propose to say what we think—that they should reduce the number of people in Europe.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, there is another aspect to this matter so ably presented by the majority leader this morning.

Every Member of this body believes that one of the most important issues in the world today is the effort being made to attain a meaningful nonproliferation

treaty, one designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Focusing attention on the importance of reducing nuclear weapons, as I see it, is to reach some agreement in reducing conventional weapons.

Today, perhaps really for the first time, a major suggestion is being made, in this resolution, for consideration to be given to the importance of reducing conventional weapons in Europe.

The statement of the majority leader presents well the fact everybody knows the tensions in Europe are less than they were at the time the rules were set with respect to the required number of military in that part of the world. I would hope, and in the not too distant future, that high people in this Government meet with comparable officials in the Government of the Soviet Union; and that the thinking behind this resolution could be developed to a point where we could say to the representatives of that great country: Here is an opportunity also for you to extend practically what we both know is best for the future of the world; namely, a reduction in military forces, your military forces in Europe.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I have not the slightest objection to the procedure which has been worked out. I share the view of the majority leader that we should bring troops back from Europe.

But I would like to reinforce what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has just said, which I think is of great importance. I would not bring one American soldier back from Europe unless the Russians took one Russian soldier out of East Germany, and out of the area they control in Eastern Europe.

I think we are missing the boat and I urge the majority leader to think seriously about revising the resolution so that the resolving clause would call upon the President and the Department of State to enter into negotiations immediately with the Soviet Union for the purpose of agreeing on one of the several plans discussed for years for the mutual withdrawal of Russian troops and American troops.

I think that we are giving away something that we do not have to give away. I think that we should do this on the basis of an understanding with the Soviet Union which would require them to match our troop reductions, rather than having them say to us: Your troops go home but our troops stay there.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] would be very logical and his statement would be cogent, provided our allies lived up to 100 percent of their commitment and the balance of European forces—West and East—could be more equitably determined. We are heavily committed in Vietnam, and nobody is worrying about our efforts for peace and security there except American mothers. We are sending troops to Vietnam by the thousands. At present there are about 300,000 men there, there may be 600,000 men before we are through.

At the same time our allies in Europe are taking the position that possibly we

should not be in Vietnam at all, but we should be heavily committed where the Red peril threatens them. But their sense of danger is not strong enough to persuade them that they should live up to 100 percent of their own commitments.

We have been discussing this time and time again—over and over again. Every time the foreign aid bill has been before our Committee on Appropriations, I have discussed this specific matter with Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. All that they say is that they are talking with our allies about it. They had better talk faster. And the answers better be audible. This has been going on for 15 years—and time is running out on patience.

We are heavily committed in Vietnam. We are spending \$2 billion a month to sustain our effort there.

That effort is for no plunder for America—but only for the peace of the world—Europe no less than Asia.

We want little people left alone to determine their own destiny—not to be overwhelmed by Peking—no less than we shield free Europe from Moscow.

Whether we are right or wrong in this in Europe or Asia is apart from the question. American boys are dying in Vietnam. At the same time Europe is thinking only of Europe and we are being told: You have got to live up to 100 percent of your commitment in Germany. On the other hand, General de Gaulle is telling us to get out of France. France that we freed can stand on its own feet now—so he tells us to get out of France; and the General's word is law and we have to follow his admonition to get out of France.

We have to release about 16,000 civilian Frenchmen who work for NATO. What do these French nationals do? They join an organization and ask for severance pay. They want 1 month's pay a year for each of the 16 years we have been there. To do what? To guarantee their personal security. We are more worried about their overall security than they are. We live up to 100 percent of our commitment and the best that that nation can do is 80 percent.

Let us be fair. If the peril exists in Europe, who should know this better than the Europeans? If they, who should know it better than we, say the peril is imminent, then why do they not live up to their share—100 percent?

Our query is as simple as that.

Now, the Senator would have us say to the Russians: We will take out one American if you take out one Russian. We are not saying to the Germans, Italians, French, British, and everybody else there, that we want to keep the same ratio—man for man.

If the best that our allies can do is 80 percent because they do not think the peril is really there, the best that we should do is 80 percent. That is all that we mean here in pure, simple English—and in the simple mathematics of the manpower we should invest in their own assessment of clear and present danger.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I ask that the Senator from Missouri yield to me further so that I can reply to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I am sure that the Senator from

Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] will recognize the fairness of giving me 1 minute.

I share the emotional involvement of my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], both with respect to the unnecessary acceleration of the war in Vietnam and the unnecessary troops that we have in Europe, but I think we should act with our heads and not with our hearts. The important thing is to get the Russians to pull some of their troops back.

I renew my suggestion to the majority leader to determine carefully and prayerfully over the weekend whether he does not want to revise the resolution to get something from the Russians, and not because we are mad at NATO.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I have only one slight modification to suggest to the Senator's terms. In connection with the emotional involvement, will the Senator correct the Record to say the emotional emphasis of the Senator from Rhode Island? It is the emphasis on facts that invites emotion.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to do so. I am emotionally involved. I think that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] gave evidence that he is also.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, if the resolution comes before the Senate, it is subject to amendment. In my opinion we are acting with our heads and not on the basis of emotion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader, and would say to the able Senator from Pennsylvania that when he says he does not want to see a single American soldier taken out of Europe unless a Russian soldier is taken out of Europe, at least to some extent he is talking against the logic of his concept with respect to the overall problem of arms control.

None of us of course would want to see a single American soldier removed from Europe if we felt that that soldier, at this time, was important to the defense of the United States and the free world. But as the Senator from Rhode Island so well pointed out, those far closer to the situation, by their action as well as their words, have emphasized to us over the years that all these men are not important. It is clear therefore that their interest could well be economic instead of military.

I lose my colleague when he talks about 1 for 1. As I understood, what we are trying to do, in discussion of such matters important to the future of the world such as the test ban treaty is find out how we should or can take the first step in a disarmament program.

Again, let the able people of this Government meet with representatives of the Soviet Union, state what discussion has been going on on the floor of the Senate. We are aware of the number of divisions the Soviets have in East Germany and the satellite countries. Saving money through reduction on their part and ours could provide the resources needed to help their economy, and our economy, their cities and our cities, their education and our education; all this by not continuing to spread military forces of any type around the world.

Mr. CLARK. What I am saying is that I do not want to see it done unilaterally.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I would say this, from this side of the aisle: We have heard the assistant minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I came into this discussion this morning and on yesterday afternoon. It was my understanding that the majority leader would offer this resolution, make a little speech about it, and then we would get on with the business of the Senate which is before it under limited debate.

If we are going to discuss even the spirit of this resolution at this time, certainly a quorum call should be suggested so that Senators on my side of the aisle can come into the Chamber and give their views.

I sponsored what was said by the majority leader a few minutes ago, that he was going to offer the resolution this morning, that it would lie on the table for further signatures to be brought up at a later date, and then we could discuss it in full and give our reasons pro and con as some of the distinguished members of the Democratic policy committee have done this morning; and then we could decide whether to send it to committee or discuss it right here on the floor of the Senate, as being the sense of the Senate.

Madam President, I certainly hope that we will not be giving our views pro and con at this time. I do not believe it is right. If there are any more suggestions along those lines, I shall certainly have to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Republican Members on this side of the aisle may express their views, as well as Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Therefore, I hope that we can get on with the business of the State, and discuss the resolution at a later time, as it has been my understanding the majority leader wishes to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] has been on his feet for a long time, waiting to be recognized—I believe it is on this subject, is it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I do desire to speak on this subject for about 4 minutes. I have been on my feet for quite a long time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, before yielding the floor, I ask unanimous consent that 4 minutes may be allowed the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], and that at that time debate begin on the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in conclusion, if I may, let me say that this resolution was endorsed by the full policy committee. At their direction, it was presented. I fully favor it. If I did not favor it, I would have presented it anyway.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I am in complete accord with the purposes of the resolution offered by the majority leader and I compliment him

on it. The fact is, for more than a year, many Senators have spoken out in this Chamber advocating that we return our soldiers from Europe where they are not needed, where many of them are living like squaw men with their wives and children.

Madam President, in the Chamber I see the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. They have all spoken time and again in favor of bringing our soldiers back home.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do not forget the Senator from Louisiana. For over 5 years I have been preaching the same thing.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. I certainly include the Senator from Louisiana. I remember other Senators have been preaching that we bring the boys back home and there are plenty of reasons for doing so.

For example, 10 years ago, this Nation had almost \$22 billion in gold reserves. Today, we have \$13½ billion, a loss of almost \$8½ billion. At the same time the gold supply of other countries has risen by \$13 billion. That has been spoken of in this Chamber by Senators MORSE, McGOVERN, ELLENDER, TALMADGE, and many other Senators.

Were the United States called upon to pay all of its obligations in gold, we could not do so.

At the same time we maintain in Western Europe 400,000 members of our Armed Forces and 370,000 of their dependents and civilian employees. In France, the chief beneficiary of the outflow of gold from our country, we have 75,000 men and their dependents, who will soon be transferred elsewhere. We ought to bring them all home. Bringing hundreds of thousands of officers and men and their dependents home from France and other nations of Western Europe will not only cut down the drain on our gold supply, but will make troops available for assignment to Vietnam and other places where they are really needed.

Following World War II, there was a bitter cold war raging with the Soviet Union and there was a threat of aggression which required the presence of our Armed Forces to deter the Russians. Stalin was then dictator of the Soviet Union. That threat of aggression no longer exists. The threat of military aggression by the Communists in Europe has all but vanished. The present rulers of the Soviet Union are no longer rattling their missiles. The Russians are veering toward capitalism. The Soviet Union is no longer a have-not nation. Its leaders now appear principally dedicated to the objective of raising the standard of living of their people. At the present time we are contributing up to approximately one-third of the manpower and almost 80 percent of the cost of defending Western Europe.

Madam President, the nations of Western Europe are strong enough today, both militarily and economically, to cope with whatever danger remains and provide for a much greater share of their defense needs.

In World War I the United States loaned immense sums of money to our allies. Great Britain, the chief beneficiary and our largest debtor, owes the United States \$9,400 million. Great Britain has made only a token payment. France defaulted completely.

In World War II we loaned huge sums to Great Britain under lend-lease. For the most part, these obligations were settled after the war on a basis highly beneficial to our allies. We loaned our allies nearly \$39 billion during World War II—\$16 billion of this amount is still owing.

When De Gaulle persisted in making claims upon our dwindling gold supply, U.S. officials suggested that instead of taking our gold, France accept credit on its old World War I debt to us. Of course, De Gaulle refused. Instead, France today follows a policy of consistently drawing on the U.S. gold supply, month after month, to our fiscal detriment and to the detriment of the economy of the entire free world.

From 1945 to 1966 we gave France more than \$9 billion, Italy more than \$6 billion, and Western Germany more than \$5 billion. These nations, which have become rich and prosperous, show anything but enthusiasm about coming to our aid and assisting us in Vietnam. Not one has sent even one soldier to South Vietnam.

Madam President, at the very best our troops in France and in the NATO countries must be considered as a token force rather than an effective striking force. We can improve our military and financial situation greatly by bringing most of our Armed Forces and their dependents home.

Furthermore, by our Operation Airlift we have proven we can airlift a combat-ready division to West Germany from the continental United States in a matter of hours.

The nations of Western Europe can today provide the necessary troops to defend themselves if that remote need should ever occur.

Those countries should do this for themselves instead of continuing to depend on us. Let their young men be conscripted and drafted into their own armed services. Why should the lives and aspirations of our teenage young men be disrupted to form the first line of defense for the German and French Governments, whose officials and nationals have come to despise us?

It is nitpicking to advocate that American tourists, men and women schoolteachers, and husbands and wives who save money for a vacation in Europe, should forgo their trips to reduce the outflow of gold when we have 400,000 men of our Armed Forces in Western Europe, plus wives, dependents, and American civilians, employed by the Armed Forces. That is where the real outflow of gold takes place.

SUPPORT FOR MANSFIELD RESOLUTION TO WITHDRAW AMERICAN TROOPS FROM EUROPE

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Madam President, I express my high commendation to the majority leader and to the members of the policy committee of the majority party for bringing to the floor

of the Senate this morning the resolution which was placed on the desk, to wait for cosponsors. That resolution proposes a cutback in American troop deployment in Europe.

Madam President, some of us have been urging this cutback for some years. Time has not permitted me to check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to the exact date of the first time that the senior Senator from Oregon stood on the floor of the Senate and urged the diminishing of American troops in Europe. It was early in 1963.

I repeated it over and over again. I listened with great interest and complete approval to the argument of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASMORE] this morning when he pointed out that we are the only country that has kept its commitments under NATO.

It has been said sometimes that West Germany has also done so. West Germany has not. West Germany is a country that has come the nearest to it, other than the United States. But the United States is the only country that has kept its commitments under NATO.

I have a special interest in this subject because I was one of the three assistant floor managers of the NATO treaty in 1949, appointed by the then ranking Republican of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan. The other two assistant managers were Senators AIKEN from Vermont and Senator TOBEY from New Hampshire.

I was assigned the most controversial article of the treaty, article V. It was called the "one for all, all for one" article. It was the target of the isolationist press and the isolationist group in this country.

That article, of course, made clear that an attack on any member country would be considered an attack on the United States.

I defended on the floor of the Senate the promise that the United States would respond to any such attack without any need for further consideration by Congress of whether there ought to be a declaration of war. In those days we met in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, because this Chamber was being refurbished at the time.

In the course of our argument, as that historic debate will show, we pointed out that the NATO Treaty did not pledge us indefinitely, but that the NATO Treaty pledged us for the life of the treaty. That was a period of great world crisis as well as national crisis, and the pledges that were made were certainly justified and highly needed.

The stationing of large numbers of troops in Europe followed as the military force of NATO was developed. It was about 1952 that we sent large numbers for the NATO Treaty force.

But, Madam President, we have had a great deal of experience since then with NATO and with our NATO allies. For many years I have urged a cutback in our troop deployment in Europe, because it became perfectly obvious that the need for that deployment had diminished. At the time of the formation of NATO, there was a very serious threat of a Russian

march across Europe to the sea, and I believe that at that time the United States was the only insurmountable barrier to that march.

Madam President, our NATO allies undertook the same solemn commitment that we did when they ratified NATO, and I think that we had the right to expect them to keep their commitment to furnish troops just as we did. But they did not. Certainly, in more recent years, after our expenditure of a good many billions of dollars for the rehabilitation of our NATO allies under the Marshall plan they have overlooked the fact that we have helped to rehabilitate them to the point that they enjoy prosperity the like of which they never enjoyed throughout their history.

I am afraid it is true that a good many of our NATO allies have been willing to let the American taxpayer pay a disproportionate share of the cost of maintaining the defenses of NATO. In those early days, Mr. President, we had a clear duty, in order to maintain peace in the world, to make the investments in money and manpower that we made. But the threat now from Russia has diminished. Our partners know that. That is why they have not fulfilled their obligations to the treaty force.

It was brought out in the debate this morning that some of our allies no longer fear Russia, that it is perfectly obvious that Russia shows no intention of following a course of action of aggression in Europe. She has learned to know better.

Madam President, I also agree with those who spoke this morning in opposition to the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], that a resolution such as this should not be adopted unless it contains a provision that we will withdraw a man from Europe if Russia will withdraw a man from the Communist section of Europe.

I disagree with that proposal on many grounds, Madam President. I disagree because we will never get anywhere, in my judgment, in reducing the danger of world war III, and that danger is increased as long as we continue to maintain heavy contingents of American military forces abroad. I say that I shall not go along with the idea that we will withdraw only if Russia withdraws, because, in my judgment, we will strengthen the chances for peace, the chances of avoiding a war, if we put Russia in the position where she is the one who is maintaining large numbers of military forces in the Communist section of Europe.

Madam President, if she does this, she admits that she has to keep them there to control the East Germans. That is the main reason for keeping them there.

We can demonstrate that we do not need to keep such a large contingent of American troops—and we are not talking about taking them all out—in Western Europe, because Russia has a large number of Russian troops in East Germany, since she really keeps them, not because of any threat from Western Europe, but because of threats within her own Communist dominions.

We have an opportunity here to reduce the level of our forces in an area where the need for them has greatly dimin-

ished. I would like to see us make this move as proposed by the resolution introduced by the Democratic policy committee, because I think that would put Russia on the spot.

Arguments will be raised that this in some way may weaken the security of the United States. That is a lot of nonsense. We know that, if Russia moves, it will not be a question of ground troops in Europe that will maintain the security of Europe or of the United States. We all know that we have gone far beyond the era of conventional warfare in Europe. We all know that, if a war develops in Europe, it will not be a conventional war, but a nuclear war. That will be the case whether or not we reduce our manpower on the spot. It is the nuclear umbrella of the United States that provides the protection for Europe, not these large numbers of ground troops.

Of course, a residual minimum of ground troops is necessary. But if one wishes to talk about the horrible thought of the danger of war with Russia, then let us face this fact: A large number of ground troops maintained where they are maintained, in the case of a nuclear war, are but sitting ducks, to be obliterated in the very early stages of that nuclear war.

So, I think we ought to follow a course of action quite independent of what Russia does with her forces in the Communist-controlled areas of Europe.

Also, we have an obligation to the American taxpayer, for the maintenance of these large American forces in Europe is a heavy drain upon our economy and is causing great injury to us economically, from the standpoint of our balance-of-payments problems.

But there is something else I want to stress in these remarks in support of the objectives of this resolution. As Senators know, I have pointed out many times that the road to peace is not down a military road. The road to war is down a military road. The sad fact is that the United States, in connection with its foreign policy, has been paving military roads and not roads of peace. We have scattered around this world hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of American troops. Our image has become one of great ugliness and is interpreted as an image of Mars, instead of the image that ought to characterize the American republic. Except for Soviet forces in Eastern Europe, we are the only country in the world which has large bases and exceedingly large numbers of men in uniform outside of its territorial limits. Except for the troops that Russia has outside of its borders, but on its borders, in the area of its Communist satellites—principally East Germany—Russia does not maintain troops abroad.

We hear much said about Communist China being a threatening military power, without a Chinese soldier outside her borders. But close to her, perhaps more than 300,000 American troops are in uniform.

If we think that that is giving an impression throughout Asia that we are a country of peace, we could not be more wrong. In fact, this emphasis on the

part of the United States of military power and a foreign policy that is so slanted toward the use of American force is losing us friends by the millions around the world, and is creating the impression that we have become the major threat to the peace of the world because of our emphasis upon militarism.

If we follow this course of action that this resolution calls for in respect to our troops in Europe, I think it would be a great lesson to the world that we are seeking to travel a road of peace. But I have one caveat. I hope it is not contemplated behind this resolution, that after the troops are removed from Europe, that they will be sent to Vietnam.

If that is the development, of course, it will destroy all of the value of bringing the troops back from Europe, as far as teaching the world a lesson that we seek a peaceful solution to the problems of the world that threaten the peace of the world. That is why I hope that in the not too distant future my President and my Government will change their foreign and military policy in Asia.

I have said many times that I do not propose an abrupt pullout of American troops from Vietnam, but I do propose a great reduction in them. A great reduction in them would be possible if my Government would follow the recommendations of a General Ridgway and a General Gavin, and their supporters within the military authorities of our country, although they are now retired.

But General Ridgway happened to be the leader of the American forces in Korea. On the basis of that experience he has advised against the course of action we are following in escalating the war in Asia. General Gavin was our top military strategist when he was in uniform. The brilliance of his military mind is implanted upon the war plans of our country as far as military preparedness is concerned. He has advised against our policy of escalation in Vietnam.

If we continue the course of action that we are following of escalating this war in southeast Asia, we are going to involve the American people in a war for many years to come. It will be a war in which we will win all the military engagements of any consequence, and completely lose the peace; a war in which we may negotiate what appears to be a surrender, but the surrender will not be capitulation to our policy, but only result in a prolonged guerrilla warfare, with the ever-present danger and possibility that China may be drawn into the war, to be followed by Russia.

Before we recess for the Labor Day weekend I wanted to make these remarks, completely disassociating myself from the speech which the President made before the American Legion, completely disassociating myself from the speeches the President made last weekend as he went into Oklahoma and Idaho, and back to Texas, in which he makes a plea again for what adds up to a further escalating of this war, and a plea to the American people to back him up in the escalating of this war, which means, of course, I think, increas-

ing the danger of an all-out third world war.

I shall continue to disagree with my President in regard to his warring policies, his Presidential war—for it is a Presidential war, never having been declared under the constitutional processes of our Constitution.

I want to say to the American people that if we continue the course of action the President is proposing for escalating this war in Asia, we will not only needlessly and unjustifiably sacrifice increasing thousands of American troops in southeast Asia, but we shall also place ourselves in the position of an isolated nation.

But the resolution offered some hope that at least there is a growing recognition in the Congress that we are going to have substituted the rule of law for the jungle law of military might. I see great potentials and great possibilities in this resolution.

Madam President, I close by saying that I hope my President will not mistake the cheers of the populace as an expression of opinion on the part of the American people that they want him to turn us into a warring power and, at the same time, as he was professing to do, doing it in the name of peace.

We cannot win peace with bullets. I say to my President that we have some chance of winning peace with bread.

WAR AGAINST THE REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, recently Mr. Harold Miller, president of Miller-Rellim Redwood Co., appeared before the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee and testified that he was "openminded" and did "not oppose the idea of a Redwood National Park." But, alas, those were his views but for a fleeting moment.

He then proceeded to break off negotiations by which Secretary of the Interior Udall was attempting to persuade the company to stop cutting the heart out of the proposed Redwood National Park. Secretary Udall was in a position to offer Miller-Rellim financial assistance, through the interest of a charitable organization, to defray the added costs, if any, were Miller-Rellim to remove its saws and axes to another location, away from the proposed park area.

Secretary Udall quite properly termed Miller-Rellim's arbitrary refusal to stop its spite cutting as an outrageous public-be-damned, conservation-be-damned approach to this whole issue.

But the clincher was yet to come. Mr. Miller then traveled to San Francisco, where he held a press conference in the Sheraton-Palace Hotel to announce plans for what was termed "a war" against the Redwood National Park. Miller told reporters he would "fight park plans to the end."

Madam President, last spring I introduced S. 2962 to create a Redwood National Park in northern California. I did so because several years of discussions have led me to the firm belief that the creation of a great Redwood National Park is completely in the public interest.

Shortly after I introduced the bill, reports began filtering back to me that spite cutting was being carried on by the Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. on its properties within the proposed Redwood National Park boundaries. These reports came from the Department of the Interior, from the National Geographic Society, from conservation groups in California, and even from concerned citizens of Crescent City, Calif., the home of Miller-Rellim.

I studied maps, aerial photographs, talked to experts and viewed the area with some of my Senate colleagues from a helicopter. Only then, and with mounting indignation, did I reach the conclusion, now confirmed by the testimony of Mr. Miller, that the company has recently clear cut an area along the west bank of Mill Creek between the company's mill and the south edge of Jedediah Smith State Park, and that the company is now cutting a 400-foot-wide swath, a corridor, from Mill Creek easterly along the south edge of Jedediah Smith State Park separating the State park from 7,000 acres of prime virgin redwoods on Miller-Rellim property.

I ask you, Madam President, why would a company owning 24,000 acres of land in Del Norte County, of which only 18,000 is within the proposed park boundaries, be cutting in the single specific location most damaging to the park value of its land? Why would a company scour a path along the edge of the most magnificent existing redwood park? There can be but one answer: this cutting is an integral part of this company's war against the park. It wishes to destroy the park quality of the area before Congress can finally render a decision to create the park.

At a hearing in Crescent City last June, I asked Mr. Miller, in general terms, if Miller-Rellim would shift its cutting while my bill is being considered. He turned aside my request as infeasible.

On July 13, I repeated my request in somewhat more specific terms in a letter to Mr. Miller. After two delaying responses, the company rejected my request in a letter read at the open hearing on my bill before the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on August 17, 1966.

At that hearing, as I indicated, Secretary of the Interior Udall announced that private money was available to compensate Miller-Rellim for the economic loss, if any, caused by temporarily shifting its operation to a less vital area. The short, unproductive talks which followed, between Mr. Miller and Secretary Udall, are memorialized in their letters of August 18 and 19.

Today Miller-Rellim obstinately continues to cut in the most crucial single area of the 18,000 acres which it owns within the proposed park boundaries. Miller-Rellim continues to disfigure the virgin area by enlarging the scar at the south edge of Jedediah Smith State Park, although I believe there is a near absolute certainty that a Redwood National Park bill encompassing his property will

be adopted by Congress within the next year.

One salutary result has arisen from the recent hearings, however. Prior to the hearings, Miller-Rellim had closed off its property to the National Park Service in order that the Park Service might be prevented from taking pictures which would show the Senate Interior Committee the company's spite cutting. As a result of the hearing, Miller-Rellim has realized that it cannot hide its perfidy. It has at last agreed to permit the Park Service employees access to its property. At least, that is what it now says.

I voice the hope that the President will reaffirm his interest in this project by calling upon Miller-Rellim to shift its destructive cutting, and by calling upon Congress to start moving the bill to create a Redwood National Park.

The irresponsible campaign which this company is waging against the Redwood National Park is against the public interest. It brings discredit upon the entire American forest products industry. In answer to Miller-Rellim's declaration of war on the Redwood National Park, I call upon all Americans to join the battle for the park, and I call on the forest products industry of this country to dissociate itself from Miller-Rellim's disgraceful spite cutting tactics.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence to which I have referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with excellent editorial comments on the immoral cutting by Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. from the Washington Post, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the San Jose Mercury.

There being no objection, the correspondence and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 13, 1966]

THE SLAUGHTER CONTINUES

All appeals to the Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. to halt the slaughter of giant trees in the area proposed for a Redwood National Park appear to have failed. At the recent hearing on the proposed park in Crescent City, Calif., Senator KUCHEL made a direct request of Harold Miller, president of the company which now owns the land, that it shift its operations elsewhere until a decision is made as to where the park shall be located. The request was rebuffed. When fresh evidence of continued cutting in the proposed park area came to light, Senator KUCHEL renewed his appeal by letter. The only reply has been an evasive letter from Mr. Miller's lawyer.

Meanwhile the National Park Service has been denied opportunity to photograph the area. Senator KUCHEL seems to us to be fully justified in his conclusion that the company "is pursuing a program designed to destroy the park value of this portion of its timberlands by cutting out its heart." And now it is trying to conceal that act from the public by denying access to the proposed park area.

In these circumstances President Johnson might well request suspension of the cutting until the decision in Congress can be made. If virgin redwoods continue to go down at the present rate, the country may well find, within a few years, that there are not enough left to justify the creation of a national park.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 27, 1966]

PUBLIC BE DAMNED

The public-be-damned attitude taken by the Miller Redwood Co. calls for a drastic response. After all appeals to the company's public spirit and sense of fairness had failed, a Senate Interior Subcommittee brought Harold Miller, president, to Washington and confronted him with a generous offer made through the Secretary of the Interior and an unnamed foundation to reimburse the company for any losses it might sustain from moving its lumbering operations out of the area designated for the Redwoods National Park. Mr. Miller arbitrarily refused.

In effect the Miller company has pleaded guilty to spite cutting of giant trees that the Government wishes to save. Is the great United States helpless in the face of this flagrant slap in the face? One man has asserted the right to destroy what virtually the whole country wants to preserve. There ought to be a ready means of dealing with this kind of outrage. We hope that the Government will not give up until every expedient has been employed to cope with this ruthless defiance.

President Johnson could try to bring the company to its senses by a special request that the spite-cutting cease immediately. If this should fail, the Interior Department would be justified in seeking an injunction in the courts. Though the land is still in private ownership, its purchase has been recommended to Congress for national park purposes. No one should be in a position to destroy its value as a park before Congress can act. The injunction is a weapon especially designed for the purpose of restraining conduct that would inflict irreparable losses while a problem is being litigated.

If this approach did not succeed, Congress could be asked for some emergency action. Congress could order the cutting to be stopped, and pledge the United States to make good the losses if a decision should later be made not to locate the Redwoods National Park in the Mill Creek area. The gage of battle has been thrown down on an indefensible issue. The Government cannot just surrender without a critical sacrifice of the national interest.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Aug. 12, 1966]

NO MAN'S LAND

Senator KUCHEL's attack on the Miller-Rellim Redwood Company for cutting a no man's land through virgin forest marked out for a national park would be a blow at the company's public relations, if it had any. But the Miller-Rellim company is evidently not interested in either the public or the public interest. Senator KUCHEL concludes that it has forsaken other timberlands under its control and is "pursuing a program designed to destroy the park value" of the portion of its Del Norte county properties covered by his redwood park bill.

The National Park Service has been denied access to the land, and the company has failed to respond to KUCHEL's requests that it suspend cutting until Congress has had time to act. This course of defiance could have one good effect if it taught Congress the lesson that it must act faster to acquire and save recreation areas for the people.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, Aug. 11, 1966]

LUMBER FIRM SHOULD STAY ITS SAWS

Sen. THOMAS H. KUCHEL (R-Calif.) has urged the Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. to cease its lumbering activities in virgin redwood lands bordering Jedediah Smith State Park—at least for the time being.

KUCHEL points out, and correctly, that the land now being worked by the company lies

in the heart of a proposed Redwood National Park, which Congress is considering creating. Hopefully, the lumber company will withhold its saws at least until the fate of the national park is known. The next Senate hearings are scheduled for Aug. 17.

As KUCHEL observed this week:

"Some of these redwoods have taken 2,000 years to grow to their present grandeur. Those who would sever them from the earth are not answerable to Congress or the court. They are answerable to the people of this country and to posterity."

They are, indeed.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
July 13, 1966.

MR. HAROLD A. MILLER,
President, Miller-Rellim Redwood Co.,
Crescent City, Calif.

DEAR MR. MILLER: During the recent Redwood National Park field hearings held by the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in Crescent City, California, it was disclosed that in recent months your company has been moving its cutting operations into virgin stands of redwoods on your property south of the boundary of Jedediah Smith State Park.

Since you own substantial redwood acreage outside the proposed park boundaries, I asked you, during the hearings:

"Would it not be better, Mr. Miller, in the future for us to agree that, while this legislation is under discussion in the Congress, precautions be taken that the area contemplated to be used as a park be left alone to the greatest extent economically feasible?"

Your reply was:

"It would certainly not be feasible. You just cannot move your operation around that way."

No one is more conscious than I of the constitutionally protected rights of the owners of private property. The right to hold and dispose of private property is basic to our way of life.

The few remaining old growth redwoods represent a priceless, irreplaceable part of our American heritage. As the wheels of the legislative machine slowly turn and as legislation to create a Redwood National Park is pending in Congress, I believe that you, as the owner of properties which include this natural resource have a responsibility to our fellow citizens, a moral obligation, which far transcends the normal legal rights and obligations of land-holding. I believe that you have an obligation to respect the efforts of your fellow citizens to preserve some of these giants, and not to frustrate those efforts or render them meaningless. Yours is responsibility to refrain from felling these ancient trees at the very time some of us in Washington are attempting to save them.

I again urge you to publicly announce, in a spirit of cooperation and with an awareness of the responsibilities imposed upon you as trustees of this disappearing natural resource, a suspension of cutting in vital areas of virgin redwoods within the proposed park boundaries until Congress has had time to act on this legislation.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

MILLER REDWOOD CO.,
Crescent City, Calif., July 18, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In Mr. Miller's absence, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 12th. While a photocopy of your letter has been forwarded to Mr.

Miller, it is unlikely that he will have an opportunity to reply until after his return to this office on August 3rd.

Very truly yours,

VELMA JEREMIAH
Mrs. Velma Jeremiah,
Secretary to Mr. Harold A. Miller.

RAGAN & MASON,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: On July 13, 1966, you wrote to Mr. Harold Miller, President of Stimson Lumber Company. For your ready reference, a copy of your letter is attached hereto.

In your letter you asked Mr. Miller to publicly announce, with the awareness of his responsibilities that he is suspending cutting in a "vital area of virgin Redwoods."

Mr. Miller and I have discussed your letter and it was agreed that I would respond as outlined below. However, I have recently been ill and consequently have not had the opportunity of responding to your letter until today.

Before responding in substance, I must refer to the record of the hearings at which time your point was also raised, and at which time I pointed out that over fifty members of Congress have supported legislation to impose the park elsewhere. I think you must agree that the predominance of support for a Redwood National Park is not on the locus of the Administration's proposal. As was pointed out in the hearings, the park proposal has been pending for a number of years and the predominant support for a park is not in the area affecting the Miller land.

We therefore respectfully request that you advise as to whether or not similar letters were sent to other companies that are involved in cutting adjacent to the other and more heavily supported park proposal.

I would also like to call your attention—and again not as a response in kind to your subject letter—to an article in the New York Times of July 31, 1966, a copy of which is enclosed. This article points out that the Federal Government is, of itself, harvesting millions of board feet a year from virgin Redwood timber supplies. Has the Department of Agriculture been requested to cease cutting until the issue is resolved?

Because of your keen and sincere interest in the park site for the people of your constituency perhaps, before our responding in kind to your letter, it might be well if we had an opportunity for a discussion.

Very truly yours,

RAGAN & MASON,
WILLIAM F. RAGAN.

Enclosures.

cc: The Honorable ALAN BIBLE, HENRY M. JACKSON, B. EVERETT JORDAN, FRANK E. MOSS.

AUGUST 17, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This is in further response to your letter of July 13, 1966, in which letter you requested that this company suspend the cutting "in vital areas" of virgin Redwoods within the park boundary proposed by the bill that you have submitted on behalf of the Administration. We also refer to the recent letter of our counsel to you. As you will note, in the letter from our attorneys, two questions were asked.

The first question was that it was noted that the Administration bill that you are supporting may be classified as the minority bill in this Congress, since over 50 members of Congress are supporting legislation for the park to be elsewhere, and we requested your advice as to whether or not

companies similarly situated in the other areas have been asked to suspend cutting. To date, we have had no response so must assume that your request was directed only to ourselves.

Secondly, in our attorneys' letter we suggested that prior to responding in kind, that it might be well to discuss this matter. However, since you have made the matter one of public record, it is necessary that our response now similarly be made one of public record. Therefore, in direct response to your letter of July 13, we wish to state as follows:

1. We consider your request which echoes the "Save-the-Redwood League" as gross unfair and we are sorry that you have been ill-advised to become involved in demands based on emotion.

2. To condemn publicly our company for proceeding with what it has the right to do, without knowing the facts, we feel is something you did not intend to do, but we do strongly resent the implications involved.

3. You have stated on the floor of the Senate—when you went into the discussion of your request—that our company is "hell-bent" on destruction of our old growth Redwood timber. Again, this is illustrative that the true facts have not been presented to you. We attach herewith a breakdown of the number of acres that this company has logged since 1955, and the fact of the matter is that for the periods 1958 and 1959, we logged twice as many acres as we have logged since the consideration of the park. These figures will show that in 1958 we logged 804 acres. In 1965, our total acreage logged was 331 acres. For 1966, our projected acreage is but 225 acres. If this is "hell-bent" logging, it is hell-bent in the reverse direction.

4. In your statements and press releases, you have indicated to the public that what we have attempted to do is to destroy our own property adjacent to the Jedediah Smith Park, and that this is something we have done to destroy the desirability of the park. We attach hereto a chronological summary of our logging program since 1955, and if you will review this summary, you will note that in 1956 we started logging along our northern line adjacent to—but a mile south—of the Jedediah Smith park boundaries. It can hardly be said that in 1956 the Miller property was under consideration as a national park.

Thus, there is absolutely no foundation to the statement that we have been destructively accelerating our cutting because of the proposed park.

5. In your letter of July 13, you have urged us to stop operations in the so-called vital areas. As the representative of all people from California—including those from this area—we are certain that you are not aware of the implications of this request. If we were to adhere to your request, it would be absolutely necessary for the Miller Rellim Company to cease operations, plus the stopping of the new expansion of facilities, which is presently in progress.

6. Even beyond this point, it is impossible to make this move because we cannot accommodate the proper consist of the timber requirement without melding timber from the area where we are now cutting, and timber from other areas within our land. We simply do not have the proper balance of timber within our area that would support our operation unless we log as we have planned, as far back as 1955. Your proposal will close down the operation entirely and destroy the economy of Del Norte County.

7. You have further stated in your press releases and on the floor of the Senate that we have closed our land to the public, and a clear implication is made so that we can go into a destructive cutting program. This simply is not so. We have closed our land only to those who are so frantically desperate

to vindicate an untenable recommendation to the Congress that they will employ any distortions to substantiate their position. Within the last few weeks, we have had innumerable newspapermen—running from the Science Monthly magazine to the editor of the Reader's Digest, all of whom we have escorted all through the property. We have authorized Los Angeles television stations to come in and photograph. We have kept our land open to the public. We have allowed the public to come in and use the fishing facilities and the other facilities that we offer to them without charge.

We recognize your well-known judicious attitude and your spirit of fairness, and we request that this letter with, of course, such appropriate comments as you may desire to make, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since your accusations were similarly placed a short time ago, in order that all may have an opportunity to review our response.

We wish to point out—to anticipate any questions that may be raised—that as to cutting practices, our cutting is varied between selective and clear cutting, and in the areas where clear cutting is desirable the reasons are obvious, but for the edification of those who are unfamiliar, we set forth below, eleven reasons why the clear cutting method employed in this particular instance is most desirable:

1. The maximum recovery by harvesting all the trees from each acre reduces the surface area covered annually minimizing soil erosion.
2. The land remains undisturbed until the next harvest cycle, eliminating periodical recurring soil disturbances.
3. Reduces the experience of wind throw damage to the old growth trees.
4. Creates a more uniform age class for the future, and a more entire and uniform site preparation.
5. Provides for a better specie composition.
6. More efficient fire protection.
7. Eliminates growth loss in leave trees.
8. Relog operations destroy regeneration.
9. Increases growth rate of regeneration.
10. Breakage and destruction of values in the leave trees through wind storms.
11. The even age nature of the dense over mature forests in Mill Creek is not conducive to the tree selection method.

Finally, as a further illustration, to show that we are in no way attempting to cloak our activities and to show what our logging practices have been, at the conclusion of this letter we will submit to this Committee a map which will show our logging operations from the inception of our activity to date, and which will show that there has been no acceleration of our cutting in the proposed park area.

Before closing, we wish to say that we completely agree with you in your letter of July 13, that we do have a moral obligation, but we think this moral obligation lies with the people of Del Norte County who are dependent upon us for their existence.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD MILLER.

MILLER REDWOOD CO.,
Crescent City, Calif., August 18, 1966.
Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was very nice of you to take time yesterday afternoon out of your busy schedule, to meet with myself, Mr. Darrell Schroeder and our counsel, concerning the proposed Redwood National Park. As we advised Senator KUCHEL, we have a perfectly open mind and were willing to listen to any suggestions that you may have.

As I understand what you have proposed, it is somewhat along the following lines:

Firstly, you feel that you can obtain from private foundations, some funds which would be used to make up the economic losses to the company if we were able to move our present cutting arrangements.

Secondly, additional funds would be available as option money on the property if we were able to agree on what the proper price for the property is.

Thirdly, we would negotiate as to what the true price of the land would be.

Fourthly, it was indicated that if there were deficiencies dollarwise in what you are able to offer, you felt you could arrange certain tax benefits that would make up such deficiencies.

Fifthly, it was indicated to us that your arrangement would be effective at least until the end of the next session of Congress, since you indicated that you were confident that a bill would be passed during the next session, and that if it did not pass the deal would be over with, but we would, nevertheless, keep the funds made available because of the economic loss of the movements, as well as any option money paid.

As we understand it, based upon the conversations, all of these negotiations would be contingent upon the company picking up and moving its cutting operations. Yet, you are aware that we had, only within the hour, testified that any moving of the cutting operations as described by yourself, would force the company to close down. This is apparently a condition precedent to such negotiations and as long as it remains as a condition, in all good faith we must advise you that we see no point in taking up your time and our time with such discussions.

As we stated in our letter to Senator KUCHEL of August 17, and repeated in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the same date, we do feel a moral obligation in this issue and it is a moral obligation to all the people in Del Norte County who would be obviously hurt by the proposal. When we first started operations, we told the people we were there to stay. We are creating in the area a viable economy for the first time in three generations. We are there to stay. We repeat this position and hope that it will be finally accepted.

In the same meeting, we did suggest to you the possibility of viewing the matter from another aspect—namely, the redesigning of a park which would not put any company out of business and would not result in economic disaster. In fact, perhaps an alternative could be designed that would cost the Government considerably less. This was apparently met with general rejection. However, we must state in fairness that you did indicate you would be perhaps willing to discuss the "boundaries" within the present park proposal, but this seems to be the limitation of any redesignation.

During the pendency of the hearings, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON made it quite clear that he felt the price tag on the bill for the proposed park was not realistic, and it was apparent he felt for the Committee to properly judge the merits of the legislation that a realistic price should be included in the bill. In this we concur, because we are certain that when the Committee is appraised of the true costs involved, that they will know that greater value can be obtained for less elsewhere.

Consequently, we are prepared to discuss with you the true price that should be affixed to this bill, but such discussion should no way be construed as any diminution of the position that we have heretofore stated, namely that we stand opposed to the bill and we shall continue to oppose it with all the vigor that we can muster.

We respectfully await your advice.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD MILLER.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 19, 1966.

MR. HAROLD MILLER,
Miller Redwood Co.,
Crescent City, Calif.

DEAR MR. MILLER: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 18, 1966. You refused to conduct a good-faith negotiation to devise a solution that would simultaneously protect the economic position of your company, preserve the integrity of the proposed National Park, and give the Congress time to deliberate. This is incredible.

The Senate Committee hearings held in Crescent City last month and in Washington this week make it clear there is overwhelming sentiment in Congress and the country for a Redwoods National Park. It is also plain from the statement which I made publicly at the hearings last Wednesday—and the assurances which I gave you later at my office—that we can obtain Foundation commitments which will enable us to pay your company losses it might sustain by moving your cutting operation outside the Park area.

Your unwillingness to even seriously discuss such a generous solution can only mean that you and your associates have elected to pursue an outrageous public-be-damned, conservation-be-damned approach to this whole issue.

Your reply makes it crystal clear that you and your company are determined to defeat by any means available the National Park plan transmitted to the Congress by President Johnson last February. I can only conclude, therefore, that the location of your logging operations along the State Park boundary and in other key spots is, in reality, a spite cutting action designed to destroy the great trees whose preservation is the main purpose of a Park in the Mill Creek watershed.

I must also squarely take issue with your assertion that any moving of your cutting operation "would force the company to close down." All of my timber management experts who are familiar with your operation are of the unanimous opinion that your company could move its cutting operation outside the boundary of the proposed park. Presently you are cutting about 250 acres per year. Even if your 6,000 acres of timberlands outside of the Park are of different type and quality than those 250 acres inside the Park which you are now cutting, you could double your acreage cut, adjust your mill operations, extend your log haul, and continue to operate your plant for several years if you wished. You would be compensated for any extra costs involved, your employees would be retained, your profits would not be affected, and you would have performed a great public service by your discontinuance of operations in the splendid old-growth Mill Creek stands proposed for inclusion in the National Park. These experts are of the opinion that such a move would entail additional costs to your company (roads to move equipment or extra transportation costs, etc.) but these are the very costs we have offered to pay if you will cease cutting within the proposed Park.

If this were done it is obvious none of your employees in Del Norte County would lose jobs—and therefore your assertion that you owe a "moral obligation to all the people of Del Norte County" is a weak and threadbare argument. In fact, the people of Del Norte County will in the long run benefit greatly from establishment of the National Park. If your economic situation and costs are protected (as we have proposed) do you owe no moral obligation to the Congress, or to the people of the United States?

I urge that you reconsider your ill-advised decision and enter into immediate negotiations which will lead to a settlement of

this controversy which is in the national interest.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

JULY 26, 1966.

MR. ROBERT S. LUNTEY,
Assistant Chief, Office of Resource Planning,
San Francisco Planning and Service
Center, National Park Service, 450
Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco,
Calif.

DEAR MR. LUNTEY: This will respond to your letter requesting permission to take certain photographs of our property for purposes of showing them to the Senate Subcommittee concerned with the proposed national park.

Please be advised that we have conferred with our Council in Washington, and we hereby deny your request. As you should be aware five members of the Subcommittee, including the Chairman of the full committee, were recently in Crescent City and personally visited our lands. In addition to that the same group flew over the entire territory by helicopter. Accompanying the senators were representatives of the Park Service. As we are aware, many factors concerning this proposed park have been distorted and photographs similarly can cause an erroneous impression.

We consequently see no reason why in such a short space of time the expense of photographs to make expensive montages to impress the committee is necessary. Consequently, this request is denied.

Very truly yours,

RELLIM REDWOOD CO.,
DARRELL H. SCHROEDER,
Vice President.

RAGAN & MASON,
Washington D.C. August 19, 1966.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the course of the hearings on August 17, concerning the Redwood National Park, we indicated to Senator KUCHEL that while we had restricted the entrance of the Interior Department people to the park, pending the hearings, so that photography could not be used as an unfair weapon until the company was in a position to supply, in the most minute detail, the true facts of the cuttings of the Miller Company, this policy was not one that would continue after the company had had the opportunity of giving the full facts to the Committee. This has been accomplished.

As you are aware, a complete map showing the cuttings, year by year, has been supplied to the Committee and refutes beyond any question the charges of acceleration and destruction in cutting that have been so irresponsibly made.

This letter is to formally advise you that any members of the Department of Interior National Park Service are welcome on the property, assuming of course, we have some reasonable notice that they are coming and will arrive during business hours. Under those circumstances, we will be very happy to escort any persons you may designate. We would, of course, want copies of any photographs taken and will be glad to pay any costs incurred for the photographs.

Very truly yours,

RAGAN & MASON,
WILLIAM F. RAGAN.

SARGENT SHRIVER AND THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, yesterday a powerful Member of the other

body called for the resignation of Mr. Sargent Shriver as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It has been my duty, pleasure, and privilege, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to work very closely with Mr. Shriver in his administration of that program.

We have not always agreed, but I believe that Mr. Shriver's record at the Office of Economic Opportunity has been on the whole magnificent; that the American people are fortunate to have so able, dedicated, and inspiring an individual at the head of the antipoverty program.

Talk of his resignation is, in my judgment, ill advised. I have complete confidence in Sargent Shriver as an administrator. I have the highest regard for the job he has been doing at OEO.

I do not deny—there is no question—that mistakes have been made in the administration of the poverty program. This is a wide-reaching and brandnew Federal program which inevitably has had growing pains. Nevertheless, the war on poverty has been successful in reaching into thousands of communities and helping 11 million impoverished Americans in 50 States. These programs have been long overdue to them.

Mr. Shriver should be warmly commended for a great job.

The real barrier to growing progress in the war on poverty is the lack of funds for 1967, which is why I am so eager to secure rapid Senate action on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, which I hope will be reported shortly to the Senate. We must act quickly to keep this vital program going.

I do hope Members of the other body will share my sense of urgency in this matter and that we will have no personal attacks on dedicated and able public servants.

FOOD FOR PEACE ACT OF 1966

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 41929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The first amendment to be considered is by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The purpose of the amendment, as I understand it, is to add additional members to the advisory committee. The new members would be the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and four members from each of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

At present the advisory committee consists of the Secretary of Agriculture, the

Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the AID Administrator, and the chairman and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. That is what is now provided for by law. The pending bill as passed by the House and reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would add the next ranking majority and minority members of the Agriculture Committees so that four members of each of those committees would be on the advisory committee. The Senator from Oregon would further add the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the top two members from each party of the House and Senate committees dealing with foreign relations. The advisory committee would then consist of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and 16 Members of Congress, 4 from each of the committees mentioned.

It is true that the advisory committee would be somewhat overloaded, but I urge no objection to the amendment. It may be well to have more people on the advisory committee, to look into the matter more thoroughly.

So far as I am concerned, I do not know of any objection on the part of members of the committee. I am willing to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I shall be brief, in view of the statement by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], which is typical of his fairness and objectivity. As he pointed out, my amendment would add the Secretary of State and Secretary of Treasury to the advisory implications of the committee. It also would add members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the advisory committee.

In my judgment, this is highly desirable, in view of the fact that it has been admitted by all in the course of this debate that there are a good many foreign policy implications connected with the so-called food-for-peace bill. My amendment would eliminate any basis for the type of comment or criticism, if you will, to the effect that the Department of Agriculture would be taking over a very important sphere of American foreign policy, and therefore jurisdictional conflicts with the State Department would inevitably be created.

Here in Congress, I am sure there is no one on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who would want to object to having the advice of the ranking members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in respect to the foreign policy implications of a food-for-peace program.

I believe that it is in the best interests of comity here in the Senate to have the committees work together on a common problem.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana very much for being willing to take my amendment to conference. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE's amendment (No. 781) was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I have another amendment to offer, which I may withdraw later.

I call up my amendment No. 782, and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] proposes an amendment, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 782

On page 29, line 8, after the word "production", strike out the semicolon and the words "and to promote in other ways the foreign policy of the United States."

On page 54, beginning at line 2, strike out the sentence "The Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to determine the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated, and to determine the commodities and quantities thereof which may be included in the negotiations with each country."

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I should like to hear the objections of the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, the primary purpose of the law is to use our agricultural production, instead of dollars, to provide assistance to our friends abroad who need such assistance. In doing this, it appears appropriate that it be done in a manner that will advance the foreign policy of the United States. Both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State therefore have an interest in this legislation, but the Secretary of Agriculture should have the dominant interest. The use of our agricultural commodities for this purpose has a very great impact on the operation of our agricultural plant. It affects marketing quotas, acreage diversion, price supports, surplus disposal, market prices, domestic supplies, and all other facets of our farm program.

In 1955, a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive hearings on the operation of the program and found that the State Department was interfering with the use of our commodities under the bill, preferring that we furnish dollar aid, and let other countries sell the commodities thus thwarting the purpose of the law. A bill was introduced by me and many other members of the committee to correct this situation. That bill was approved by the committee and by Congress. It inserted the sentence which would be stricken by the second part of the Senator's amendment.

Even with this sentence in the law, the State Department has frequently indicated a preference for dollar aid over commodity aid, but the presence of this sentence in the law has contributed greatly to its being carried out in accordance with the intentions of Congress.

I point out further that if the Senator's amendment is adopted, we would

be striking out the foreign policy purpose of the bill and, at the same time, opening the door to administration by the Secretary of State.

The committee felt that the importance of administration by the Secretary of Agriculture was such that it gave special emphasis to it in its report, at page 22, beginning at the top of the page.

The Senator from Oregon, in his printed explanation of the amendment, indicates that there is confusion in authorizing the President to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly countries, while authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated. We do not believe that there is any inconsistency in these provisions. The President will, of course, negotiate and carry out the agreements, but we desire to make it clear that he would look to the Secretary of Agriculture rather than the Secretary of State for determinations as to the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated, and even more particularly with respect to the commodities and quantities which are available and should be included in those agreements.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Does the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that with the expanded membership of the advisory committee, if any real problem develops in connection with the Secretary of Agriculture seeking to enter into arrangements or agreements that would, in the opinion of the State Department, be inconsistent with the best foreign policy interests of the country, we could have the benefit of the advisory committee's views? Also, could not the Secretary of State himself take up any question with the President, who supervises both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture?

Through the advisory committee arrangement, which we have just adopted, do we not provide a check on the Secretary of Agriculture in case he should seek to follow a foreign policy course of action which the State Department believed was inimical to the foreign policy interests of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that. As I suggested a moment ago, the President, in all events, makes the contracts and agreements with foreign nations. Even if the Secretary of Agriculture should make his own determination, I feel certain that the President would consult with the Secretary of State. The fact that we have included the amendments suggested by the Senator from Oregon provides another inlet by which the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture can coordinate their efforts in the administration of the program.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the observation of the Senator from Louisiana. For the purpose of making legislative history—and I shall then withdraw my amendment—I wish to express again today the concern that I expressed yesterday with respect to a possible diminution of the authority of the Secretary of State over foreign policy. Many times

I have expressed concern that the Department of State is permitting its authority in the field of foreign policy to be eroded. In my judgment, we are finding that the Department of Defense is assuming too much authority in the field of foreign policy. The Agency for International Development, likewise, has assumed too much authority in the field of foreign policy.

I should like to see the Secretary of State exercise greater checks on AID than he has been doing for some time past. Similarly, I do not want to see the Secretary of Agriculture build up a rival bailiwick that could be considered a division of the Department of Agriculture with respect to foreign policy. Matters of foreign policy should be funneled through the Department of State.

Moreover, it will be much easier for Congress to write the standards under which aid to any field may be extended if all the programs are administered together.

Because I think the advisory committee, as we now have revised it, provides a reasonable check against the fear that I have expressed, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, there has been repeated reference in the debate to the portion of the report, contained on pages 21 and 22, dealing with this precise question.

I think, to illuminate this whole question, it would be well to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the part of the report beginning with the words "Section 401" on page 21 down to the words "Section 402" on page 22.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 401 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with other Government agencies and within policies laid down by the President, to determine the commodities to be furnished under the act, taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover. The new dimensions which this legislation gives to our food-for-peace programs are most important; in fact, they are essential to meet conditions that prevail today. The new dimensions of self-help and use of non-surplus commodities add to the importance of the principle expressed in section 401 of this bill—that principle which assigns to the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility for determining "the agricultural commodities and quantities thereof available for disposition under this act, and the commodities and quantities thereof which may be included in the negotiations with each country."

The Congress has always held that the Secretary of Agriculture should have major responsibility for the Public Law 480 program. This responsibility is even more important under the new conditions that prevail today, and especially under the new concepts now being incorporated in this bill.

We are—in this legislation—eliminating the surplus requirement, which, up to now, has been a limiting factor on food-for-peace programs. This is appropriate in view of today's conditions, but it also adds significantly to the importance of administrative decisions as to the agricultural commodities and quantities that are available for programming, and the commodities and quantities which may be included in the negotia-

tions with each country. Responsibility for such decisions must remain with the Secretary of Agriculture because they are so closely interwoven with the Secretary's responsibilities for domestic farm programs.

There have been some ideas expressed that under this new program food aid is going to become just a part of the foreign assistance program, and that it will then be treated just like dollar aid. We want to make it clear that this is not the case.

Surely we expect that it will be administered in coordination with our other kinds of foreign assistance. And surely we expect that increasing use will be made of our expert agricultural know-how—in the USDA, in our land-grant colleges, and in the abilities of our farmers—to help the hungry nations to help themselves.

But food aid cannot be treated just like dollar aid. If we had wanted that we would have turned it into dollars and put it in the Foreign Assistance Act.

Food aid cannot be treated as dollar aid simply because this would present too great a risk to American farmers and American consumers. Domestic needs and supplies, together with price supports and acreage allotments that affect agricultural production, must be integral factors in our food aid program. This is why food aid must be handled separately and this is why section 401 insures separate handling by vesting responsibility in the Secretary of Agriculture.

This section also (1) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated, and (2) provides that no commodities shall be made available under this act if domestic requirements, adequate carryovers, and anticipated dollar exports as determined by the Secretary could not be met.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment has been withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 784

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I think there ought to be an official action on each amendment. I call up amendment No. 784 and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 55, line 14, strike out all of section 406.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I withdraw my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 783

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 783 and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN CURRENCIES.—Sales financed under this Act may provide for payment in foreign currencies only to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury determines at the time of each such sale that the existing or anticipated requirements for such foreign currencies for payment of United States obligations abroad are such that an excess of United States Government holdings of any particular foreign currency is not likely to result.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I should like to hear from the senior Senator from Louisiana on that matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, this amendment would prohibit sales for foreign currencies in excess-currency countries. For fiscal 1967, Burma, Ceylon, Congo, Guinea, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia have been determined to be excess-currency countries. Other countries that are very near to becoming excess-currency countries are Brazil, Bolivia, Finland, Indonesia, Morocco, Paraguay, Sudan, Syria, and Turkey.

The object of making sales for foreign currencies is twofold:

First, we provide the recipient country with needed food and fiber to be distributed through the normal channels of trade.

Second, the proceeds are then used in part for the economic development of the country, so that further aid will become unnecessary, or for the payment of U.S. obligations. Under this bill particularly, we intend that the currency shall be used in large part to develop the agricultural plant of the country so that it will be able to feed itself.

In all of our discussions in committee, India has been constantly considered, and a very great purpose of this bill is to help India. India is already an excess-currency country and this amendment would prohibit any sales for foreign currencies to India. It would thwart the bill's purpose of assisting India to develop its agricultural plant.

We have recently increased our wheat acreage allotment by about a third, and we have increased our rice acreage allotment for the purpose of sale of these commodities to India and other countries for foreign currencies. This amendment would require either that we reduce our allotments of wheat and rice or be faced with a surplus of those commodities.

The Senator from Oregon in his printed explanation of his amendment points out that similar language is already provided in the pending legislation applicable to our military assistance program. The situation there, however, is not comparable to the present situation. Foreign currencies derived from sales of military hardware are not available for the economic development of the purchasing country, whereas that is the principal purpose of foreign currencies received from sales under Public Law 480.

With respect to India, if dollar payment with a 2-year grace period and a 20-year repayment period is required, it would pose an enormous burden. India's external debt is now about \$7 billion and is rising rapidly. Repayments are now running at the level of \$300 to \$400 million per year, and dollar payment would place a burden of an additional \$100 million per year by 1970.

The food margins in India are very thin. The population pressure is great and is unceasing. Against this is the Indian Government's fear of mortgaging the future. Harder repayment terms on our part could lead to a decision by the Government of India to curtail requests for Public Law 480 commodities which would maintain, if not increase, the degree of malnutrition and possibly even

starvation among the poorer classes in India.

As I have just indicated, Madam President, under this amendment many other countries would not be able to purchase the commodities so badly needed by them for foreign currencies and they could not possibly buy for cash or long-time credit. It would really defeat the purpose of the bill, in my humble judgment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I shall withdraw the amendment when I finish my statement. However, I should like to have the assistance of the senior Senator from Louisiana for legislative history.

What concerns me is that we have a bill that gives the American taxpayer the impression that we are selling a certain portion of these agricultural products, but actually we are selling them for soft currency in the foreign countries, which currency, because of the restrictions placed upon it by the foreign country, is worthless to the American taxpayer.

It seems to me that we would be more forthright if we were to make a grant of the goods, rather than to take foreign currency in many of these countries.

The Senator has talked about India. There is no better example of the problem that I raise.

The American taxpayer has been taken advantage of by India time and time again in connection with the so-called sales of agricultural products for Indian currency. That currency is kept in India and only a very small percentage of it can be used to pay for certain personal service in our Embassy or consulates throughout India and for certain maintenance expenses of American installations in India.

When I was in India in 1957, I used some of this soft currency to pay for functions sponsored by our Embassies and consulates to enable our Senate group to meet with local business and legal organizations.

Of course, I could have paid for these official functions with American dollars made available by the Senate. However, I discovered that I had authority to draw soft currency belonging to the United States in India, while the Ambassador and Consul General had no such authority. I took the position that the functions should be paid for with this American-owned soft currency and I signed the necessary orders.

But the Indian Government almost invariably finds, if we want to spend this currency for other purposes, that it would be disruptive to the Indian economy. That is their out. So we say to the American taxpayers that we are getting paid, and we are not getting paid at all. The foreign currency is locked up, not circulated, and we cannot spend it. I would rather give them the food than go through what I think is the false maneuver of saying that we sell it to them.

What can we do in regard to this soft currency problem in order to at least get

greater use of that soft currency for the United States and the country concerned?

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, that is a very good question. Under the bill as we have presented it, our Government can more or less force India to use more funds to develop its agriculture; and under the agreements that will be entered into, there can be a provision that India shall use so much of its resources to develop agriculture. After the amount that it usually uses is reached, then we can insist that some of these counterpart funds be used in order to assist India to further increase its agricultural program, so as to make India more or less self-sustaining in that regard.

In the past, much of the aid was used to develop industrially. But under this bill, we can now insist that it be used to develop agriculture. It is my belief that if this new policy is followed through by our Government, it will only be a question of a few years until India should be self-sustaining.

For instance, under this new law, we can insist that instead of putting up, let us say, a plant to make steel, they make fertilizer—something to aid agriculture.

Another feature, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, is that we can insist that some of these funds be used to develop education along agricultural lines.

Under this bill the emphasis is being put on agriculture. These funds can be used to further develop agriculture, and thereby make it possible that we will soon be out of India, insofar as our selling surplus food for her to carry on.

Mr. MORSE. I note that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has come on the floor, and I want to make this comment in his presence, because this is very important legislative history.

The Senator from Ohio and I have stood shoulder to shoulder on the floor and in the Committee on Foreign Relations, to seek some procedural changes in this handling of soft currency abroad, with particular reference to India.

The Senator from Louisiana has pointed out that, in the past, it has been used for industrial development. But what kind of industrial development? The industrial development of a state socialism in India, not the industrial development of a private enterprise. Indirectly, we have been exporting state socialism, through this type of aid.

I completely agree with the Senator from Louisiana that we should insist that they use some of these counterpart funds to develop fertilizer plants, but private enterprise fertilizer plants; farm machinery plants, but private enterprise machinery plants.

The Senator from Ohio and I were in India last fall. We went into some of these areas, and we were very much disturbed to see the use to which our aid is being put. It is quite inconsistent with what we profess is essential if we are to export economic freedom.

This is important legislative history, and the chairman of this committee being the man that I know him to be, I know he will help ride herd, so to speak, on the Department of Agriculture and

the Department of State, through the advisory committee that has been set up in this bill, to put a stop to the type of use of funds that State and Agriculture have been guilty of in the past.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is also here, and I know of debates in which he has joined, in insisting that we get for the American taxpayers some benefit out of the soft currency funds that are being stored away in these foreign countries and not benefiting the American taxpayer one iota.

Mr. TALMADGE. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon for the matter he has brought up today.

I point out that in the committee report on this bill, the Senator will note the committee amendments on page 10. The amendments appear on half of page 10, all of page 11, and about two-thirds of page 12. The committee has tightened up this bill tremendously, to seek to accomplish the very purpose that the Senator from Oregon points out to the Senate.

One of the amendments included in the bill was offered by the Senator from Georgia, and it was agreed to unanimously. That amendment will permit the sale of these excess currencies, up to 25 percent of the total amount of future negotiated contracts, to American tourists; and in that way we can utilize foreign currencies and also can reduce the dollar deficit that has been increasing so rampantly in recent years. The dollar deficit has continued to increase without any indication of improving.

It is my feeling—and I am sure that it is shared by every member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—that we should utilize these soft currencies not only to the best advantage of developing food in the donee country or the country to whom we sell, but also to the best advantage of the Government of the United States, in attempting to do so drastically curtail our dollar deficit and stop our gold drain, which is one of the most serious threats that face our Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, if my time has expired, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution to this legislative history.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the section of the committee report that the Senator from Georgia has referred to, starting on page 10, under the heading "Committee Amendment," running over to the next section on page 12.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the text of the House bill, restores a number of provisions of Public Law 480 which were omitted from the House bill, and makes a few other minor changes. The committee felt that the omitted provisions had been carefully considered by Congress before their adoption, and provided safeguards which should be continued in the law. The committee substitute differs from the House text in that it—

(1) Changes the short title of the bill to "Food for Peace Act of 1966."

(2) Clarifies the language of section 103(a).

(3) Amends section 103(b) to reflect the change in dollar credit terms described in item (17) hereof.

(4) Permits sales determined by the President to be in the interest of the United States to countries dealing with Cuba and North Vietnam.

(5) Restores the exchange rate provision currently in the law.

(6) Provides for publicizing the concessional nature of title I sales, instead of marking the commodities themselves.

(7) Restores the existing requirement that foreign currencies be convertible to the extent consistent with the purpose of the act, and in any event to the extent necessary to pay obligations to the host country.

(8) Requires foreign currencies received under future agreements to be convertible to the extent of American tourist expenses, or 25 percent of the currencies so received, whichever is less.

(9) Restores the existing requirement (for government-to-government transactions, as well as private trade sales) that dollar credit sales not displace cash sales.

(10) Clarifies the language of section 104(b) (3).

(11) Restores the existing provision limiting the use of foreign currencies without appropriation for emergency relief to nonfood relief and \$5 million per year.

(12) Permits sales of foreign currencies for dollars to U.S. citizens in nonexcess, as well as excess, currency countries.

(13) Provides for the use of foreign currencies to finance the planning of nutrition programs in friendly countries.

(14) Restores the existing limits on grants and uses of repayments so as to subject them to Appropriation Act or committee approval.

(15) Restores the existing minimum interest rate on foreign currency loans (the cost of funds to the United States).

(16) Exempts "excess currency" countries from the requirements described in items (14) and (15). Requires the amount of the excess to be devoted to the acquisition of buildings and grounds for U.S. purposes and to additional agricultural self-help. Requires Presidential reports on the extent and use of the excess.

(17) Restores the existing requirements that deliveries on dollar credit sales be made within 10 years and that payments begin in 2 years and be completed in 20 years. (This amendment, together with that described in item (3), preserves the significance of dollar credit terms as "hard" terms while permitting the transition contemplated by section 103(b). The amendment described in item (3) provides for transition either to dollar sales or to foreign currency sales which will provide the same dollar return to the United States as would be returned by the softer dollar credit terms provided for by the House text.)

(18) Requires dollar credit sales agreements to specify the economic development to which the sales proceeds will be devoted.

(19) Makes it clear that private trade dollar credit sales are subject to all applicable provisions of the act (including prohibitions against dollar displacement and the limitation on transshipment).

(20) Strikes out the provision which would have extended the CCC commercial export credit program to private stocks and authorized appropriations to reimburse CCC for credits extended under that program.

(21) Restores the current provision prohibiting CCC from financing basic freight charges (as opposed to extra costs resulting from cargo preference) and extends it to dollar credit sales.

(22) Includes establishment and expansion of institutions for adaptive agricultural re-

search among the self-help criteria of section 109.

(23) Makes it clear that the proviso in section 109 is intended to be a positive requirement of law, rather than a standard suggested for the President's consideration.

(24) Requires title I agreements to show that the recipient country is engaging in a self-help program, and provides for termination of the agreement if such program is not carried out.

(25) Changes the title I annual authorization from \$2.5 billion, plus carryover, to \$1.9 billion, plus carryover.

(26) Changes the title II annual authorization from \$800 million, plus carryover, to \$600 million, plus carryover.

(27) Makes it clear that section 201 does not contain a broad grant of authority for nonfood assistance to needy persons.

(28) Expresses the sense of Congress that the assistance of other countries should be sought, particularly through the world food program.

(29) Restores the provision authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated.

(30) Prohibits the disposition of any commodity under the act if such disposition would result in a shortage.

(31) Makes it clear that the act is applicable only to U.S. produced agricultural commodities and products.

(32) Restores the provision requiring expenditures under the act to be shown in the budget as expenditures for international affairs and finance.

(33) Requires the President's annual report to be made not later than April 1 and to describe the progress of each country's self-help program.

(34) Amends section 3(d) of the bill to provide that cotton product exports shall be financed in the same manner as exports of products of other agricultural commodities, without regard to whether the raw cotton content accounts for a substantial portion of the sales price.

(35) Strikes out the provision of section 3(e) requiring voluntary adjustment programs to be fixed so as to provide a carryover equal to at least 25 percent of consumption and exports, and further amends section 3(e) to provide that the special CCC sales price restriction would be 120 percent of current support, plus carrying charges, and would be applicable to wheat when the carryover was less than 35 percent of requirements.

Mr. TALMADGE. Thirty-five in number.

Mr. MORSE. Thirty-five in number.

This will be a great step forward, if it is carried out. I express great concern about the extent to which we can expect the executive branch to carry out our legislative intent. Its record thus far has not been very good in these matters.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the so-called Cooley amendment provided for loans to private firms for economic development, not more than 25 percent of the foreign currencies were permitted to be used for that purpose. Now we provide that these currencies shall be devoted to that purpose to the maximum usable extent.

The Senator will note, by referring to page 17 of the report, that the committee feels that private business can and should play a much greater role in the economic development of countries being assisted by the Public Law 480 program; and it insists that a substantially larger

percentage of the foreign currency proceeds from such sales be utilized for loans to private business to accomplish such objectives.

So we have raised the amount of these foreign currencies that can be loaned to friendly business to do the thing that the Senator is talking about. And in our report we encourage such use.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. That is needed in every one of these countries, and particularly in India. She is not alone, but she is one of the worst examples.

I remember that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] led the fight in the Committee on Foreign Relations against the attempt to get great sums of money from the American taxpayers for building a steel plant to be owned and operated by the Indian Government.

When we went there last fall, we had quite a discussion with them about that. Their alibis in that field fell flat on the spokesmen.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much the friendly comments made about my fight respecting the use of soft currency American dollars in foreign countries to promote socialistic governments.

Last fall, with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators, I went to the Far East, and the judgment was uniform that wherever there was socialism there was dormancy in the growth of the economy. In those countries where there was some sign of freedom, where free enterprise operated, there was activity. If I had any question in my mind about the ability of socialism to produce a dynamic economy, it was confirmed when I was there. India sanguinely believes in the socialistic form of government. The more it is promoted, the more its economy stagnates.

If this bill contemplates, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated, the promotion of private enterprise through our aid, there is no better help that we can give to those countries.

I subscribe fully to what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to further emphasize that a new direction is being given under this bill for the use of these funds. There is no doubt in my mind, having traveled quite a bit over the world, that most of the socialistic countries or communistic countries want to make a big show, and the way they do it is by building a large industrial plant to increase industrial production, to the detriment of agriculture.

Under this bill, and through the advisory committee that we have reconstituted, we will have a say as to how these funds shall be used. I shall insist that a maximum amount will be used for agriculture. If that plan is followed I visualize that in the next 2 or 3 years India should be on the way toward producing a sufficient amount of food for its use.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. How much time do I have remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, while we were in India one of the vital questions discussed was famine in India. Of course, the testimony revealed that they needed fertilizer plants. A large U.S. industrial enterprise wanted to build a fertilizer plant. The Indian Government, said, "No, you cannot build it unless you allow us to run it." Everything they have run has been run into the ground. It is simply unbelievable that while people are dying from famine—food was not to be had in many places—they insisted on adhering to their socialistic method of solving economic problems.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that I believe that out of that trip came a very salutary result because they subsequently decided to admit that American company and allow it to run the plant.

If this bill will do what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has just said about the use of soft currency, and what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said, I subscribe to it with great vigor.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to point out another matter before I withdraw my amendment.

We make a mistake when we talk about India as though it were an entity. I see the former Ambassador to India [Mr. COOPER] in the Chamber. I hope that he will give heed to what I say in case he wants to make some observation about it.

India is not one country. India is a country divided into a series of provinces, with insistence upon rights from province to province.

One of the things that our delegation observed with shocking surprise was to get to the border of one province where they did not have a scarcity of food, and see wagon loads drawn by oxen, and many trucks lined up at that border, stopped by the officials of that province refusing to let them take that food into the next province in which there was a great scarcity of food.

Who said, "How do you justify this? How do you justify this maldistribution of your own food in your own country, and then cry on the shoulder of the United States for exportation of shipload after shipload of wheat?"

They have internal problems with regard to distribution of their own food. We are told in this country about the great shortage of food in a province, but we are not given a report of the surplus food that may exist in another province in India. We have the mistaken idea that the Indian parliament has the power

to order the distribution of food. I wish to say on the floor of the Senate today that India has some internal housekeeping to put in order in respect to such problems as this.

The second and last point that I shall make is to call to the attention of the Senate that it was in 1957 that I set a precedent for the Committee on Foreign Relations which has been followed since. This bears somewhat on the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia in regard to making use of soft currency that we have stored, in millions of dollars worth, in India. I use India as a horrible example because it is a horrible example.

I got into India in 1957 as the chairman of a Senate delegation to the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference. I found that our embassies and consulates, as I traveled in various parts of India, had already spent all of their representative funds and had done so for months previous. Various groups in India, such as the bar and Supreme Court of the Province of Madras wanted a state function, a province function, but they wanted it paid for by the American consulate. The function was arranged, but I discovered I could sign as the head of the delegation for use of American soft currency in India that the Ambassador could not sign for, and that the Consul General in Madras could not sign for. Therefore, I proceeded to pay for the functions on the basis of my signature as chairman of the delegation. I was told this was the first time that had ever happened to a traveling congressional delegation in India. I found out later that it was also the first time it had ever happened to a traveling congressional delegation anywhere else in the world. I made a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations when I returned. This is all a matter of the printed RECORD now. I was sustained by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has become common practice on the committee since. I understand—and the Senator from Louisiana can tell me if I am right—it has been common practice, when the Senator from Louisiana has gone abroad representing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Do not get the idea that it was enthusiastically received by the Indians at the governmental level. But, that was a most appropriate use of American soft currency. I am glad to hear the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Louisiana point out in this debate that they think steps should be taken by the executive branch to have some of this money made available for American tourism. This is natural with the balance-of-payments problem. I think the American taxpayers are entitled to have Congress get really hard boiled and tough on this matter—that is why I am making this legislative history today—and tell the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that they had better stop coming up here asking for authorization and appropriation bills for the various foreign assistance programs involving the expenditure of taxpayers' money unless they are willing to insist in their diplomatic relations with other countries—where we have these huge accumulations

of soft currencies belonging to us but which are not expendable or which are not expendable because of restrictions which foreign governments have placed upon their spending—that it must stop. We have got to use this money for such things as the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Georgia have pointed out in this debate; namely, to plow it into Indian agriculture, for example, so that they can get on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. McGOVERN addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I withdraw my amendment, I wish to yield first to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and then to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to enlarge upon what my good friend the Senator from Oregon has just stated about our use of Indian rupees. As many Senators know, I have made quite a few tours of the world. I furnished to the Senate, I think it has been 11 written reports, 8 of them Senate documents. The record will show that in all these countries I never used a single cash dollar. I always used counterpart funds. Of course, it put me to a lot of trouble to do that, but at the same time the record will show that every dollar advanced to me by the State Department to make these tours I returned to them 100 percent by using counterpart funds—as the Senator from Oregon says he used—in India.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I simply want to draw attention to what I think are rather hopeful developments along the lines the Senator from Oregon has been discussing. One was a news report in yesterday's Washington Post to the effect that for the first time the Indian 5-year plan puts agriculture at the top, in the No. 1 priority position. It remains to be seen how successful and how diligent they are in carrying out that objective, but at least this is the first Indian 5-year plan that has clearly given agriculture the No. 1 priority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD news articles from the August 30 and 31 issues of the Washington Post on India's new 5-year plan.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1966]
INDIA SHIFTS PRIORITIES IN 5-YEAR PLAN; AGRICULTURE PUT AHEAD OF INDUSTRY

NEW DELHI, August 29.—India's fourth five-year plan, which envisages a total capital outlay of about \$32 billion will give highest priority to the development of agriculture and increased food production.

This was the first time that the emphasis has been taken from industrial development, which was the theme of the first three plans.

The plan published today should have started in April but has been held up until now because of uncertainty over foreign exchange resources.

A draft outline of the plan presented to Parliament listed principal tasks for the country during the next five years. They include price stabilization and increased agri-

cultural and industrial production to promote exports and replace imports.

The plan proposes an annual growth rate of 5½ per cent in national income and a rise in per capita income of 3 per cent a year.

Per capita income in India now is about \$61.60 annually. A 3 per cent annual increase for the five years would bring it up to about \$70.

The plan estimated that \$8400 million would be needed in external credits for the five years of which \$1700 million will go toward loan repayments.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1966]

INDIA NEWS AGENCIES URGED TO EXPAND
(Reuters)

NEW DELHI, August 29.—Information Minister Raj Bahadur said today he would try to encourage Indian news agencies to distribute news abroad, as he considered foreign agencies were giving a distorted picture of the country.

He told Parliament, however, that there was no question of the Indian government setting up its own international news agency.

He said the government's effort would be "to encourage our news agencies to enter into collaboration with agencies in different countries, for example Yugoslavia, the United Arab Republic and other African countries to give a basis for collaboration, thus ensuring that undistorted and correct news is provided."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1966]

INDIA PLAN AIMS TO RAISE AVERAGE INCOME
(By Warren Unna)

NEW DELHI, August 30.—India's fourth five year plan, which Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's government submitted to Parliament yesterday, means to raise the average Indian's income from \$59.60 a year to \$70.92; provide him with three more ounces of wheat or rice a day; and clothe him with 78.7 inches more of cotton length every year.

To a Westerner these goals—over a five-year period ending in 1971—may seem modest almost to absurdity. But here in India, where the population, which is desperately poor, now is just about half a billion—more than two and a half times that of the United States—the new plan is, if anything, overly ambitious. Its total cost, the equivalent of \$316.6 billion, is regarded by many, including Finance Minister Sachindra Chaudhuri, as simply way beyond India's purse.

PREMIER'S VIEWPOINT

But Mrs. Gandhi and her Minister of Planning, Asoka Mehta, are convinced that the only way to get India moving is to jerk it up by the seat of its dhoti. And the Prime Minister, anticipating criticism of the plan's size in a broadcast earlier this month, declared: "The maximum we can do is the minimum we should attempt."

In the eyes of India's well-wishers in the American Government and in the World Bank, the new plan is probably well on target. It gives highest priority to producing more food and trying to get ahead of hungry appetites through population control. On first glance the plan also apparently aims at making India grow and go ahead through greater use of her existing industrial capacity—instead of spreading herself too thin with all sorts of new projects. But, as the Times of India editorialized today, "The (plan) document is far better at defining the problems and fixing the goals than at indicating how precisely they are to be reached in the present political context. Even where it does say what ought to be done to achieve a particular objective it does not pause to ask whether, in the light of past experience, this can or will be done."

The planning commission says that less than one fifth of the new plan's foreign ex-

change outlay will have to come from foreign aid—and a good amount of this will be devoted to paying interest and retiring past loans.

FOREIGN AID CRUCIAL

But whatever the percentage, this foreign aid increment is so crucial that the fourth five-year plan has been in the revision stage for over a year while waiting for the United States, India's biggest benefactor, to resume the economic aid she had suspended at the time of last fall's war between India and Pakistan. And the first year of the new plan, which began last April 1, had to be launched on its own while waiting for the over-all plan to catch up.

Even now India has not received the full long-range commitment she would like and is aware that a renewed outbreak of hostilities with Pakistan could bring about another aid suspension. Moreover, Mrs. Gandhi's government currently is having a hard time with opposition cries that she submitted to the Western demand that India devalue her rupee on the promise of a lavish foreign aid commitment to the plan that has not yet materialized.

In addition to her dependence on foreign aid to make the plan succeed, India also is depending upon her own economy growing. And yet last year's rain failure showed how the caprice of nature could turn what had been a record agricultural growth into a huge deficit one.

For these reasons Mrs. Gandhi's government has tried to make the new plan antecedent to a fifth five-year plan which will free India from further foreign aid dependency by 1976. And the current plan has "core" elements that are to receive top priority even if India's own resources should again hobble her.

FOOD OUTPUT PUSHED

The first priority goes to agriculture with food production being pushed in areas with an assured supply of water and soils particularly responsive to fertilizer, insecticides and high yielding varieties of seeds. The fourth five-year plan would have an India that produced only 72.3 million tons of food grains last year produce no less than 120 million tons during the plan's final year ending March 31, 1971.

The plan would have a national birth rate that is now 40 per thousand of population reduced to 25—all within five years! And the plan makes special mention that if the allotted equivalent of \$1.264 billion doesn't produce enough loops and other family planning devices for success an additional equivalent of \$1.920 billion will be made available.

The plan obviously is predicated on reaching a sufficient food surplus through increased agricultural and decreased human production to provide India with the basic stability for other types of economic improvement.

Even in a plan as ambitious as India's new one, not everything can enjoy top priority. For this reason, India's planners envision 18.5 to 19 million new jobs being created during the plan's five years despite the fact that some 23 million more people are expected to enter the labor market. Since India's first three five-year plans failed to provide jobs for some nine to ten million people entering the labor market during their periods, India's planners have had to grit hard in recognizing that this country will have a whopping 14 million eligible people unemployed by 1971.

Mr. McGOVERN. Part of the credit for that recognition of the importance of agriculture should go to Members of Congress, members of the executive branch, and others who have been working with like-minded people in India toward that end.

Some people might argue that more important than the Indian food problem is her population problem. Many of the things we try to accomplish under our aid programs in various parts of the world are offset by uncontrolled population growth. But here again, the pending bill will be good news. For the first time in a congressional enactment we are specifically and clearly permitting the use of some of the currencies generated by this program for family planning and population control.

Thus, I think that on those two points the Senator can at least say there are grounds for hope.

Mr. MORSE. I want to thank the Senator from South Dakota. Those are hopeful grounds.

If I may make a very quick comment while the Senator from Ohio comes back to the floor, we were talking about the predominance of the state Socialist attitude on the part of the state government officials of India. I want to tell the Senate one of the reasons for it. This is a country in which the total population is highly illiterate. Illiteracy in India today is at a very high rate. A great majority of the educated people of India are in government. They are really an aristocracy of the mind.

I remember, in 1957, Prime Minister Nehru complained to me, in a conference I had with him about sending students to the United States, that there were two problems. One, although Indians were pledged to return to India, many of them used every device they could to remain in the United States and, too frequently, the State Department helped them remain. If they went to medical school in the United States, they were encouraged to go on and become doctors and remain in the United States as doctors, instead of returning to India. Prime Minister Nehru said that, as a result, serious consideration was being given to a cutback in the whole student program, so far as India was concerned, in sending students to the United States.

Then, he said, the second problem arose when the students, returning to India, did not want to go back to the villages they were trained to serve; they all wanted government jobs, and that they wanted to come to New Delhi or to the governments in the provinces rather than to go back and intermingle in the communities from which they had come in the first place.

Thus, there has developed a tremendous bureaucracy in the Government of India. We have our problems with bureaucracy in this country, of course, but we would have a lot to learn from India if we wanted to increase bureaucracy in the United States. God forbid.

The tendency has developed on the part of Indian Government officials to have the Government run the business of the country to give all these people something to do.

Thus, that is part of our problem, it seems to me.

That is why I was so glad to hear the Senator from Louisiana say that he has been trying to urge the use of these counterpart funds not only for agriculture but also for education in the local country.

If we can help encourage the need for education in India, I think we will also be helping to develop its private enterprise system, by seeing to it that more and more of their people are educated for something other than government employment and thus help to check the tendency of the Government to take over their industries.

Mr. President, before I withdraw my amendment, I yield at this time to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas in order to present a conference report.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1284) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY IN METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINERAL INDUSTRIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8989) to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move adoption of the conference report. I yield back the remainder of my time—30 seconds.

The conference report was agreed to.

ELIMINATION OF ANTI-JUNTA AMENDMENT FROM FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for yielding me this time.

I am informed that the conference committee on the foreign aid bill has eliminated a crucial amendment which would have cut off all U.S. aid to Latin

American governments which came into power by unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government acting in accordance with its constitutional mandate. This amendment was approved by the Senate without opposition after an effort to strengthen it even further was defeated by a roll-call vote.

Elimination of the so-called anti-junta amendment represents a grave setback to the democratic cause in the hemisphere and to the lofty objectives of the Alliance for Progress. Its elimination will regretfully be interpreted in the hemisphere as a clear admission that U.S. foreign policy is based on a double standard—one directed toward Communist regimes and another toward military regimes. We should have avoided such interpretations of U.S. foreign policy. The opportunity was provided by this amendment, and the opportunity was lost in conference.

In addition, the result of the conference committee's report will be to further confuse the world as to the objectives of U.S. foreign policy. For the conference committee's action came just 5 days after the President declared in Denver:

In the Latin American countries we are on the side of those who want constitutional governments. We are not on the side of those who say that dictatorships are necessary for efficient economic development or as a bulwark against communism.

It was my view when I proposed this amendment—and it is my view now—that the objectives of the Alliance for Progress and the OAS Charter are entirely incompatible with U.S. aid to regimes that came under this amendment and continuation of U.S. aid to such regimes is so damaging to our policy in Latin America as to require the utmost justification on the highest level.

The problem of dealing with the illegal overthrow of constitutional, democratic governments is the No. 1 problem facing the hemisphere today. It simply cannot be ignored any longer. This amendment represented an effort to bring the question into the realm of collective hemispheric action. The governments of the hemisphere already took a first—though hesitating—step toward dealing with recognition of de facto regimes at the Second Special Inter-American Conference last November. Approval of the amendment would have encouraged further steps.

This anti-junta amendment was, of course, primarily a procedure through which the will of Congress could be expressed. The President remained the final arbiter. The President can still carry out the policy of this amendment to deny economic and military aid to military regimes taking over constitutional governments, restoring such aid as the result of collective action in the hemisphere, or if not, only in cases having unusual justification in the national interest of the United States.

I am unaware of the reasons why this amendment was dropped in conference, but I hope the administration, especially in view of the President's statement in Denver, will honor the policy. If it does

not, it will be a grave blow to our promising efforts to restore our close relationship with Latin America, a relationship cruelly jarred by the Dominican incident.

FOOD FOR PEACE ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14929) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators each have 1 minute left.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I have at the desk, but I have some comments to make on an amendment already withdrawn.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I withdrew my amendment No. 782 a few minutes ago. That amendment reads:

On page 29, line 8, after the word "production", strike out the semicolon and the words "and to promote in other ways the foreign policy of the United States."

On page 54, beginning at line 2, strike out the sentence "The Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to determine the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated, and to determine the commodities and quantities thereof which may be included in the negotiations with each country."

The RECORD will show that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and I had a colloquy, the substance of which was that, under the advisory committee which has been set up, the administration would be fully protected in making its wishes known to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I did not know, at the time I withdrew the amendment—and I will stand on the withdrawal—that the administration supported the amendment.

There has been handed to me from the State Department, in behalf of the administration, a note. I only want to say this about it for legislative history, because it will also serve as legislative history for the Secretary of Agriculture: that the administration fully supports my amendment 782. I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree that under the legislative history, due notice is served on the Secretary of Agriculture. Procedure is available in the bill—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Procedure is available in the bill for the administration not only to make its position known to the Secretary of Agriculture, but the procedure is also available in the bill for the President to issue orders to the Secretary of Agriculture, or, in case he makes decisions without the knowledge of the President, to rescind those orders. So I think the withdrawal of the amendment, to which I committed myself, will in no way handicap the administration in carrying out the administration's policy. But if difficulty arises that requires legislation in the future, I shall not hesitate to offer such legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, I call up my amendment No. 777. It has been modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment, as modified.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 777) as modified, as follows:

On page 54, line 16, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That the term 'agricultural commodity' shall not include tobacco or products thereof."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment as it was originally printed would have precluded any gifts under this program of alcoholic beverages. Since submitting this amendment, I have been advised by the Department that no alcoholic beverages have ever been included under any title of the program heretofore and that there would not be with or without this amendment. Therefore it would serve no useful purpose to include this part of the proposal, nor would it correct any practice which has been followed heretofore.

In other words, I have been given assurance all around, by the manager of the bill as well as the Department, that alcoholic beverages would not be included under this bill with or without the amendment.

Therefore, I am confining the amendment now being offered solely to tobacco as included in the bill; that is, the pending amendment would prohibit any of the funds provided in the bill to subsidize exports of tobacco or tobacco products.

I am not trying to stop bona fide sales of tobacco or tobacco products for export as they may be purchased and paid for with dollars outside this program; however, this particular program has as its stated purpose, and I am quoting from the title of the bill, "to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition."

The title of the act is "Food for Peace Act of 1966." On page 29 the policy is described as follows:

To use the abundant agricultural productivity of the United States to combat hunger and malnutrition.

Certainly tobacco and tobacco products do not come under the category of agricultural products which are necessary to combat hunger or malnutrition.

On the contrary, the Surgeon General of the United States has stated most emphatically that the use of tobacco products is injurious to human health. Therefore, it does not make sense that any bill which provides for the use of the taxpayers' money to supply food and food products to feed the hungry people of the underdeveloped nations should provide for the subsidy of tobacco or tobacco products.

I hope that the manager of the bill and the Senate will accept the amend-

ment. Then it would merely confine the purpose of the bill to what is stated therein—solely to provide agricultural commodities for the alleviation of hunger.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator's amendment prohibit, either directly or indirectly, the sale of tobacco products?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As dollar sales, no. They could be sold outside the bill. It would stop the subsidy. In one part of the bill is a reference to sales; that means that tobacco products may be sold for foreign soft currencies, which in turn are spent primarily in the country they are obtained. In effect, such sales are substantially grants.

Another part of the bill provides for the sale of tobacco products for dollars. However, the provision for sales for dollars is set forth on page 45 of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 106. (a) Payment by any friendly country for commodities purchased for dollars on credit shall be upon terms as favorable to the United States as the economy of such country will permit. Payment for such commodities shall be in dollars with interest at such rates as the Secretary may determine but not less than the minimum rate required by section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for loans made under that section.

Thus we find that even though they may be sold under this act for dollars, the dollars received will not pay for the total cost. When full payment is being made they can be sold for dollars outside of the act. Such sales do not have to come under this bill at all.

The only purpose of the act before us is to subsidize such sales. It is true that when the commodities are sold under section 4 of the act, which provide for dollar sales, to a certain extent, we do get back the cost of the product, but I repeat, the purpose of this entire bill is to subsidize all sales, to get part payment in dollars where we can, and where we cannot, to get payment in soft currencies; and there is even a provision for outright donations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The purpose of the Senator's amendment, as I understand, is to prevent the subsidization in any manner of the sale of tobacco products under the general principle that we are aiding in the elimination of hunger.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And sales, under the bill, can be subsidized in one of two ways: First, sales for soft currencies; and second, sales for dollars, but under terms that normally do not prevail in the general market.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. Then there is an additional provision that sales can be made under the barter agreement, where we accept in

exchange commodities that are understood not to be worth as much as their price in dollars. If they were they would sell those commodities in the free market and pay us in dollars.

My amendment would also preclude outright gifts or grants of tobacco.

I understand that, generally speaking, all of the tobacco which has been disposed of under this program heretofore has been subsidized even though such subsidizing was disguised as sales for soft currencies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The objective of the Senator from Delaware is to prevent subsidization of the sale of tobacco under the guise that when we sell tobacco to a nation, we are helping that nation eliminate hunger?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the American taxpayers from subsidizing the export of tobacco to underdeveloped nations under the guise that we are furnishing tobacco or tobacco products to help combat hunger and malnutrition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 2 minutes, and yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator has forgotten to read the title of the bill, or the first paragraph in the committee report, both of which are considerably broader than the mere purpose of combating hunger and malnutrition.

The title of the bill reads: "To promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes."

Is the Senator purposely overlooking or leaving out of the discussion the fact that the bill is designed, among other things, to promote international trade in agricultural commodities?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not at all. I am well aware of those purposes.

But if what we are trying to do is to promote international trade in tobacco let us so label the bill. Instead, the bill is labeled and known as a food-for-freedom bill. I quote again from the title, "To promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes."

The whole principle of this bill has been built around the idea that in our generosity and with our overabundance of agricultural commodities we are going to try to feed the underdeveloped nations of the world. If that is not the reason for the bill let us cut out this camouflage and admit that the bill is simply a subsidy of American agricultural products and that it is not being done for the noble objective of combating hunger and malnutrition.

I am willing to support the bill if it is for the purpose of combating hunger and malnutrition, but I am not willing to sup-

port a bill to subsidize the shipment of tobacco to underdeveloped countries, a product which our Surgeon General says is injurious to the health of our own citizens.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield me 2 minutes, I wish to call attention to the fact that throughout the discussions on this bill, there have been frequent references to the fact that there is a large surplus of cotton on hand, and that the promotion of the sale of that cotton is one of the major objectives of the bill.

It is no secret at all that there is a surplus of tobacco on hand, and there is no reason in the world why we should not use this means to get rid of our surplus cotton and tobacco, just as we have gotten rid of our surplus wheat, corn, and rice. I think that the Senator, while he keeps mentioning that the principal purpose of the bill is to combat hunger and malnutrition, is unfair in not stating that the first-named purpose is to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, among which are cotton and tobacco.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I am well aware that the bill also provides for shipment of cotton. But cotton can be used for clothing. It is an essential commodity for the people of underdeveloped nations. I have no objection to cotton being included in the bill, but I do not see how we can include tobacco or tobacco products as being beneficial to the hungry people of these underdeveloped nations. Therefore, I am trying to exclude this one item.

It may be true that we have a surplus of tobacco; but let us face it, how did we get the surplus? Under another Government program we are subsidizing the production of tobacco, which creates a surplus. Now we are asked to subsidize the disposition of that surplus to people in foreign and underdeveloped countries under the guise that we are helping them relieve their hunger and malnutrition.

That is a contradictory policy. If we have a surplus of tobacco let us stop the subsidy which encourages the overproduction of tobacco here in this country, a product which the Surgeon General says is detrimental to the public health.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. This amendment would exclude tobacco and tobacco products from the definition of agricultural commodities. It would prevent their sale or donation under the act.

The determination as to what commodities should be sold or donated should be left to the President. I do not think we should begin to enumerate the commodities which at the moment appear to us as not being useful as foreign aid. We might exclude cake, ice cream,

candy, and innumerable other items, but I do not believe we should begin such enumeration.

We must remember that the countries in need of our aid are short of foreign exchange. We should not require them to spend exchange for tobacco when we have a substantial surplus supply of that commodity in our hands. We are trying to help these countries conserve their foreign exchange so that they can devote their resources to developing their agricultural plant to the point that they can feed themselves. The foreign exchange they conserve by acquiring tobacco from us is just as valuable in developing their agriculture as the same amount of foreign exchange conserved by acquiring wheat from us.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the statement of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the effect that tobacco is not an agricultural product will not bear analysis.

Six hundred thousand American farm families, embracing in their number approximately 2.5 million Americans, make their living from the growing of tobacco.

Tobacco is in, I believe, the fourth position as a farm commodity. Furthermore, the charge that the American taxpayers are subsidizing tobacco in the ultimate analysis is absolutely unfounded. The truth is that tobacco is subsidizing the American taxpayers.

Tobacco pays \$3 billion each year in excise taxes to the Federal and State Governments. In addition, it pays hundreds of millions of dollars in income taxes. It also pays hundreds of millions of dollars in various kinds of taxes to municipalities throughout the United States.

Of all the farm programs which have been put into effect, the most successful one is the tobacco program. The records show that since the farm programs began in the 1930's, tobacco's share is less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total cost of all price-supported and related farm programs. The total outlays for tobacco under the price-support program and Public Law 480 have amounted to slightly more than \$300 million while excise taxes on tobacco products have approximated some \$40 billion.

For these reasons I assert that the American taxpayer is not subsidizing tobacco. On the contrary, tobacco is subsidizing the American taxpayer and the Treasury of the United States.

I should like to point out what would happen to our balance of payments if we were to stop exporting tobacco. I think the observation I am about to make is relevant because the curtailment of tobacco exports is the object of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Four hundred million dollars worth of tobacco is exported every year. Of this \$400 million, at least 90 percent is purchased for cash by foreign countries. If we stopped the export of tobacco, we will

throw the balance of payments out of balance by an additional \$400 million.

The Senator from Delaware's amendment would not stop foreigners from using tobacco to any degree whatsoever. They will simply supply any resulting deficiency in American exports by purchases in other lands. Consequently, the only effect of the amendment would be to reduce the export of American tobacco.

I do not think that the Surgeon General of the United States is sacrosanct in his statements. Many reputable physicians and scientists say that there is no evidence of any causal relationship between cigarette smoking, or the use of tobacco, and lung cancer.

Those who take the contrary position base their opinions upon statistics rather than actual research. Mr. President, whenever I hear an opinion based on figures, I think of a story, which I have told on the Senate floor on other occasions, concerning the old southern mountaineer in my country who bought his groceries on credit at a country store.

After a time the old mountaineer went to the grocery store to pay his grocery bill. The storekeeper told him the amount of the bill, which was more than the old mountaineer thought it ought to be.

The old mountaineer complained. The storekeeper got out his account books, laid them on the counter, and said, "Here are the figures. You know, figures don't lie."

The old mountaineer said, "I know figures don't lie, but liars surely do figure." An attempt is made to condemn an industry on the basis of statistics, and without research.

After a thorough study of the statistics assembled by the Surgeon General's Office and all available sources of information, I am convinced there is grave reason to think that this is another time when figures lie, no matter how honest those who rely on them may be.

I respectfully request that the Senate reject the amendment. Passage of the amendment would harm farm families. It would accomplish no good, but, on the contrary, would be inimical to a trade policy which our Nation has long pursued to its advantage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I recognize what the Senator from Delaware has said about the title of the bill. So that the title will not be confusing to everyone, I wonder if it would satisfy the objection of the Senator from Delaware if the title were modified so that the words "both edible and nonedible" were added after "agricultural commodities," so that the title of the bill would read: "A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, both edible and nonedible, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes."

In that way we would make it clear that we are not talking about merely edible foods in the policies of international trade.

I recall that during the deliberations of our committee we discussed particularly the problem of cotton.

I believe that every committee member felt that the policies of international trade should not be defined on edible foods. The qualification that I suggest would point that up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Iowa, the description of tobacco as a nonedible food would not make it any more nutritious, nor would it help alleviate the malnutrition of hungry children.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is another point concerning the Williams amendment that I should like to discuss. The discussion of the Williams amendment has been confined to tobacco, but I should like to point out that it goes further.

It reads:

Provided, however, That the term "agricultural commodity" shall not include tobacco or products thereof or agricultural beverages.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The phrase "alcoholic beverages" was deleted based on information furnished to me by the Department to the effect that alcoholic beverages never have been included under the program in any of the sections and it was said that they would not be. Therefore, I saw no use in offering an amendment to cover something that never had happened and never would happen.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am glad to get that information, because in all of our discussion in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I never heard anything said to indicate that there was no intention contained in the bill to further the international trade in this commodity, or to use alcoholic beverages or allied items of that nature.

I accept the explanation of the Senator and I am pleased that he so modified his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was included originally because it was agreed that by an interpretation of the language alcohol products could be included. However, when I was advised that alcoholic beverages had never been included and that they would not be included under any circumstances, with or without the amendment, I modified the amendment accordingly.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, we never discussed that item at all to my recollection. I do not believe there is any intention to cover it on the part of the committee or on the part of the administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hope very much that as a result of this debate all Senators will get a better balanced idea of the purpose of this bill, and of the scope of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Senator from Delaware said that his amendment would prohibit the sale of tobacco and tobacco products under the pending bill.

I think the Senate should know and remember that the pending bill is an extension of Public Law 480, which was first enacted in 1954 and has since been amended from time to time.

Under that bill, tobacco was included from the beginning as one of the agricultural commodities which could be sold for foreign currency, and later for dollar credits. Public Law 480, as does this bill, had several purposes.

I would agree with the Senator from Delaware that the chief purpose of this bill is to provide food to the developing countries, and in so doing to insist that those countries take effective self-help measures to increase their own food production. But it is also a bill to promote the interests of U.S. agriculture—to open new markets for all agricultural commodities. For that reason, other agricultural commodities, such as cotton and tobacco, which are not food, are included.

As the Senator from North Carolina has stated, the export of tobacco is an important factor in our U.S. trade, and also in dealing with the balance-of-payments problem. Four hundred million dollars of tobacco has been exported each year in the last few years. The favorable U.S. balance of trade in agricultural products is millions of dollars over imports; and without this trade in agricultural commodities, our balance-of-payments problem would be a very dire one, indeed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that a very substantial portion of our tobacco production is exported?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. Especially of Flue-cured and Fire-cured tobaccos.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is substantial for Flue-cured.

Mr. COOPER. About one-third of the crop, I believe. It is less for burley tobacco.

Mr. TALMADGE. And also some burley?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; about 10 percent of the crop—over 50 million pounds.

Mr. TALMADGE. And a percentage of that is sold for dollars; is it not?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; indeed. Ninety percent is sold for cash.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that if we lose that market our dollar deficit will increase beyond its present condition?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

Most of the tobacco exported is now sold through the regular commercial channels of trade, for dollars. In addition, some is sold to developing countries under Public Law 480. The tobacco sent to developing countries under this bill could continue to be sold for soft currency for a time, but most of it would be sold for dollars—the payment deferred, of course, as with all other agricultural commodities sold under the bill.

One of the purposes of this bill is to enlarge the future markets for tobacco

in those countries. That will have a good effect upon our international agricultural trade, and our balance of payments.

Mr. President, I remember when the Marshall plan was enacted. I was in the Senate at that time, as was the Senator from Delaware. Tobacco was included for export to the Marshall plan countries—and one very important reason was to provide them with leaf tobacco for manufacture, which they could then sell as tobacco products and which would provide a good source of tax revenue. That is also an important factor in the export and sale of tobacco to these developing countries.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Is it not true—and the Record, I think, indicates this—that if our shipments of tobacco were cut off, say, to India or to any of these countries that would be included in this bill, those countries would use their currency to buy tobacco in Rhodesia or some other country?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, instead of Flue-cured; or perhaps a substitute burley from Canada or Italy.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Because it is one of the most valuable tax-yielding products they have. We would miss the sale. They would buy the tobacco from some other country, and we would be out.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think these points have been well made in the colloquy:

First, I want to say again that tobacco has always been included in these programs—the Marshall plan, Public Law 480, and every similar plan we have had to aid other countries. This has been so for two important reasons—to provide them a product which will give these countries an important source of tax revenue, and to provide U.S. agriculture the opportunity for markets in the future.

Second, nearly 90 percent of all tobacco exports have been for dollars. The major part of tobacco exports under this bill would be for dollars—true, upon deferred payment.

Third, the tobacco program has been under attack now for several years. The Senator from Delaware has introduced amendments before against tobacco programs, and even to abolish the price-support program for tobacco farmers. I think at times he feels it is a social evil that needs to be curtailed. But we are not enacting a social bill here.

Fourth, I insist that this commodity, which represents only 3 percent of all sales under Public Law 480, should not be discriminated against.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. If the Senator from Delaware

presses his amendment, I intend to offer an amendment to modify it so as to preserve the export sales of tobacco under Public Law 480.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, unless another Senator wishes to speak on the Williams amendment—

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, when time has been exhausted on the pending Williams amendment, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], together with several of us who have the honor to represent tobacco-producing States, will offer a substitute for the Williams amendment.

I hope that the Senate will reject the Williams amendment and approve the amendment of the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The Williams amendment is arbitrary; it is discriminatory; it picks out one particular farm commodity, to the exclusion of all other farm commodities, and directs that particular farm commodity shall not be sold under the food-for-peace program for soft currencies or dollar credits to foreign countries.

If we are to discriminate against one farm commodity, we should discriminate against all farm commodities. The production of tobacco is legal. It is produced in quite a number of States. And it is important to the economy of the States. It is important to the tax revenues of the States and the United States. In addition, it is important to the consuming members of the public who buy tobacco.

I know of no reason why we should select this product, which is produced in a particular section of the country, to the exclusion of any other product, such as rice, corn, feed grain, wheat, butter, or any other commodity that has been produced.

We should not be speaking on the floor of the Senate about one particular farm commodity and discriminating against that farm commodity to the exclusion of all others. If the food-for-peace program is important, it is important for all farm commodities. All farm commodities should be treated alike and none should be discriminated against. This amendment would do exactly that.

I hope that the amendment will be overwhelmingly rejected by the Senate, and that the Cooper amendment will be overwhelmingly agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Virginia on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the remarks previously made by the senior Senator from Kentucky and both Senators from North Carolina.

I do not consider this amendment to be a wise one or a warranted one. It occurs to me that if we are going to pass this

legislation to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, then it should be for all the agricultural commodities, and that one commodity should not be singled out for elimination.

I hope that the Senate will reject the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not take that much time. I shall merely take a couple of minutes to reply to some of the arguments that have been made against the pending amendment.

No. 1, the suggestion has been made that the adoption of this amendment would destroy our balance-of-payments program. The adoption of this amendment would not in any way affect the straight sales of tobacco anywhere in the world where anyone wanted to buy tobacco for dollars. It would only stop the subsidy of their sales.

I am not attempting to legislate on the social question as to whether people should or should not use tobacco. That has nothing to do with the question before us.

I am only raising this question: Should the American taxpayers subsidize the export of tobacco to these underdeveloped nations under the guise that we are going to feed the hungry and undernourished people throughout the world?

The argument has been made: Why single out this agriculture product? Because it is the only one mentioned in the list which our own Surgeon General has said is injurious to the health of human beings.

With respect to the argument that it is an agricultural commodity and therefore to single it out for elimination is sacrilegious. Let us face it, where does heroine come from? Heroine is derived from an agricultural product grown by farmers. Are we going to say that because that is an agricultural commodity it should be included? Certainly heroine would be worse than tobacco. But heroine is produced from an agricultural product. But the fact that this narcotic is grown as an agricultural commodity does not make it any better. The mere fact that tobacco is an agricultural commodity has nothing to do with it.

I have never tried to support legislation to prohibit a man from smoking. I would oppose such legislation.

But I do oppose American taxpayer dollars being used to subsidize production or sale of a product in this country which everybody agrees—even those who use it—is injurious to the health standards of this country.

Now let us examine the argument about the great contribution that tobacco has made to the taxpayers of America. One of the arguments made is that billions of dollars have been collected in excise taxes from the sale of tobacco and cigarettes and that, therefore, its use is beneficial to all mankind. The same argument could be used by the distillers of this country who pay a large

tax on the alcoholic beverages distributed in this country. Is the argument going to be made that if the American people drink twice as much we could pay off the national debt? Is it going to be argued that the American people could drink themselves into prosperity or smoke themselves into a balanced budget? Those arguments do not even make an intelligent smokescreen.

The announced purpose of the bill before us, as it has been portrayed by the administration, is that it is for the purpose of promoting international trade in agricultural commodities in order to combat hunger and malnutrition of the undeveloped countries.

I do not think that tobacco and tobacco products can come under the definition of this bill by any stretch of the imagination. No one is trying to restrict the sale of tobacco which could be financed under sales by the Export-Import Bank or sold direct for cash. We are only trying to restrict those cutrate sales which are subsidized at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 785

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 785, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

To the amendment numbered 777 proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to H.R. 14829, an Act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes:

On line 3, after the word "include", insert "alcoholic beverages, and for the purposes of title II of this Act,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield unto himself?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have prepared, which has been laid on the desk of each Senator, be included at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,

August 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Senator WILLIAMS is proposing an amendment to H.R. 14929. His amendment numbered 777 reads as follows:

"On page 54, line 16, before the period, insert a colon and the following: 'Provided, however, That the term 'agricultural commodity' shall not include tobacco or products thereof or alcoholic beverages.'"

The amendment would prohibit any sales or gifts of tobacco, tobacco products and alcoholic beverages. Commenting on Senator WILLIAMS' amendment, I would like to point out that alcoholic beverages have never been sold or given away under P.L. 480, and are not intended to be sold or given away under the pending bill. Tobacco has been included with other agricultural products

sold under P.L. 480. Tobacco is used by the developing countries to manufacture tobacco products, and is valuable as a source of tax revenues.

The amendment I will offer with Senators MORTON, JORDAN of North Carolina, ERVIN, TALMADGE, and HOLLAND would modify the amendment of Senator WILLIAMS so that it would read as follows:

"On page 54, line 16, before the period, insert a colon and the following: 'Provided, however, That the term 'agricultural commodity' shall not include alcoholic beverages, and for the purposes of Title II of this Act, tobacco or products thereof.'"

The effect of our amendment would be as follows:

(1) Although alcoholic beverages have never been sold or given away under P.L. 480, our amendment would specifically exclude any sales or gifts of alcoholic beverages under the pending bill. In this respect, the Williams amendment is not changed.

(2) Our amendment would permit the continuation of sales of tobacco and tobacco products, but would not permit the gift of tobacco. Title II provides for the donation of agricultural commodities, and tobacco could not be made available under this title. It is not donated now; it is sold.

We will offer our amendment when Senator WILLIAMS calls up his amendment, and hope very much that it will be adopted.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate will note that I have modified my amendment as it has been printed and is on our desks, by striking out the words:

On line 4, strike out the words "or alcoholic beverages."

I have done this because the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has previously stricken those words, "or alcoholic beverages."

So the amendment, as modified, which I have offered for myself and my colleagues, Mr. MORTON, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. HOLLAND would still amend the pending Williams amendment so as to make it read:

Provided, however, That the term "agricultural commodity" shall not include alcoholic beverages, and for the purpose of title II of this act, tobacco or products thereof.

The explanation is that although the Senator from Delaware struck from his printed amendment the words "alcoholic beverages" when he called up his amendment today, I have nevertheless included them in my amendment to make it clear that the sale or gift of alcoholic beverages is not intended and was never intended under this bill.

While the Senator removed alcoholic beverages from his amendment when he offered it today for himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], that amendment was introduced on Monday, 2 days ago, and has been printed and at the desk for at least a day. I have talked to a number of Senators; they believe they are going to vote to prohibit the sale or gift of alcoholic beverages. That impression has been left with the Senate.

We propose in this amendment to make clear that it was not intended to sell or give away alcoholic beverages under this bill. Of course, it never was so intended.

Our amendment would permit the sale of tobacco and its products, but it would not permit the charitable gift of tobacco. Tobacco is not given away now; it is sold.

So when the vote comes upon our amendment, the Senate will be voting whether or not to continue the same program that we have known since 1954, when Public Law 480 was first enacted.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, would the effect of the amendment of the Senator be toward expansion of acreage for the growing of tobacco?

Mr. COOPER. No; it would not change the present program. Our tobacco price support programs are production control programs. Each year the Secretary of Agriculture makes a determination of the expected use of tobacco and the stocks on hand, and fixes the farm acreage allotments according to that determination.

I wish to make it clear how this tobacco is disposed of now, and would be disposed of under the bill.

The Commodity Credit Corporation does not go out and sell tobacco to other countries. The private trade buys tobacco on the auction markets, or from the pools, at the market price and sells it abroad to purchasers—in Europe and in other places. It would be sold for dollars, on such terms as they presently sell tobacco.

It is true that under this bill the tobacco could be sold to these developing countries on the terms of credit prescribed in the bill, either for dollars in deferred payments or foreign currency. But during the entire history of the Public Law 480 program since 1954, 90 percent of all tobacco exports have been for dollars, only about 10 percent for credit. Moreover, tobacco has represented less than 3 percent of Public Law 480 sales of all agricultural commodities.

All we are asking is that this tobacco export programs, as it has been successfully maintained over 12 years, be continued with the added provision that tobacco cannot be given away. It must be sold.

One of the purposes of the bill before the Senate today is to promote our agricultural trade, to increase for American farmers our markets abroad, and to treat tobacco as all other agricultural commodities are treated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it the intent of this bill to negotiate solely with developing nations?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. This bill has to do alone with developing nations?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. How do we justify the use of money on the part of these developing nations to buy tobacco when we are trying to promote the idea of feeding them?

Mr. COOPER. They are going to buy tobacco from some country. If they are

going to buy tobacco, why not buy it from this country?

Mr. PASTORE. Why do we not encourage them—

Mr. COOPER. We are promoting markets for American agricultural products and for our own farmers. If we are promoting markets for other agricultural commodities, what is wrong with promoting them for tobacco and for tobacco growers? It is a legal commodity. It provides \$3 billion in taxes for this country; its export sale assists our balance of payments problem. Why try to prevent tobacco exports because of the health report that was made 2 years ago?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator from Kentucky have expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I urge that my amendment be adopted to protect our tobacco program, which the Williams amendment would seriously cripple.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague [Mr. MORTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I point out that this program is part of an overall program that has been carried out to implement our foreign policy. I understand that the conference on the foreign aid bill has recently been completed. It had been held up for some time. This program is part and parcel of that.

The points which seem important are, first, as my colleague [Mr. COOPER] has clearly pointed out, these countries are going to buy this tobacco somewhere. Second, in most countries underdeveloped or developed, tobacco furnishes a means of taxation, of generating revenues for the country. This is true in this country, as it is true everywhere—more so in other countries than here.

Even in many of the developed countries there is a so-called tobacco monopoly.

The Government itself recognizes the potential for revenues and has made a monopoly out of tobacco and tobacco processing, even, in some ways, to the selling of tobacco products. So that these countries will get the tobacco somewhere to begin with.

Third, it furnishes a base which helps them to raise revenues to develop their own economies. Now fertilizer is not in itself a consumable product. Under the foreign aid program—not this one—we subsidized and encouraged the export of fertilizer.

Why?

Because we want to help these countries become self-sustaining insofar as food and fiber is concerned.

Tobacco furnishes that same function, in that it helps the governments become more liquid and more fiscally able to do something for their own development.

I think that the amendment, which I am happy to cosponsor, which my colleague has offered, and which definitely precludes alcoholic beverages from the

act—and never was intended, because the act says that we cannot give tobacco or tobacco products away—is a good amendment. I trust that the Senate will give it its approval.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, who has control of the time in opposition?

Mr. ELLENDER. The minority leader does, but I am handling it for him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would nullify any effect whatsoever of the Williams amendment now pending. While it may sound very nice—the language is nice—I wonder why the sponsors did not also include a statement that they were for motherhood. This too would sound good.

The fact is that its purpose is to defeat the original amendment. As I stated earlier, alcoholic beverages never have been in the bill and are not in the bill now. No one ever had any intention of putting them in.

I am also advised that tobacco has not been given away under title II of the bill and outright gifts are not contemplated now.

Therefore, adoption of the amendment which would prohibit giving away tobacco means nothing.

There is no argument about the purpose of the Cooper amendment—it is intended to nullify the Williams amendment.

My amendment refers to subsidized sales under titles 1, 3, and 4 as well as gifts under title 2.

The Cooper amendment refers only to title 2 gifts. There have been no gifts anyway.

Under the bill, tobacco is sold at reduced prices for foreign currencies. We take these soft currencies in payment and largely restrict their use in those same countries. Subsidized sales under this bill do not help the balance of payments.

These so-called tobacco sales are subsidized sales, even on a dollar basis. As the Senator from Rhode Island points out, this bill deals only with underdeveloped nations. I fail to see how subsidizing exports of tobacco to the underdeveloped countries which cannot feed their own people today without our assistance—how subsidizing the exporting of tobacco is going to help anyone but the tobacco growers. I hope that the Cooper amendment will be rejected for the simple reason that adoption of the amendment would completely nullify the original amendment. It would restore the original language of the bill. If the pending amendment were to be adopted it would mean that the program would continue as it has been administered heretofore and as it was planned to be

administered under the committee bill. The approval of this Cooper substitute would be the same as a vote to reject the original amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I point out that all we are asking is that the bill as written remain as written. The program has operated in this way for 12 years, regardless of what anyone says. Tobacco is not subsidized.

The benefit to the taxpayer, as I understand, is approximately \$3 billion from a commodity grown on the farm and sold across the counter for a few million dollars—a very few. So I do not see how we can say it is subsidized, because it is not.

Any time we make more money out of something we sell than it costs to make, we are making a profit. The United States is already getting a profit from every pound of tobacco processed and sold in the United States or anywhere else in the world. It is not being subsidized whatsoever. This commodity should not be excluded from sales, because as both Senators from Kentucky have pointed out, a very small percentage of tobacco is being sold now under soft currency. Most of it is sold on credit that goes through a program which is repaid in dollars to the United States.

Thus, I cannot understand why this particular commodity was selected for deletion from the bill. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, which I cosponsored, will be adopted and that the program will remain as it is, because it was never intended to give any subsidy to tobacco. That is what the bill provided for, to start with.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I merely wish to state again that the reason that tobacco was singled out as an agricultural commodity was that tobacco is the only agricultural commodity mentioned in here which would not contribute to the noble purpose of the bill; namely, to combat hunger and malnutrition in the underdeveloped nations.

The argument of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] that tobacco and its users are subsidizing the taxpayers by \$3 billion a year is ridiculous. On that basis an even greater argument could be made on behalf of the distilling industry. Taxes on whisky and other alcoholic beverages exceed those on tobacco. If that argument of the Sen-

ator from North Carolina is correct then all that is necessary is to promote a program to encourage everybody to drink twice as much liquor and we would have a balanced budget. Perhaps we could even pay off the national debt if we smoke or drink enough. Such an argument on the part of the Senator from North Carolina is silly and has no basis whatsoever.

I conclude by pointing out again that the adoption of the Cooper amendment to the Williams amendment would mean that we will continue to subsidize the distribution of tobacco and tobacco products under this program. The result would be the same as a vote to reject the original amendment that I offered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I hope the Cooper amendment will be adopted. I am surprised that the Senator from Delaware should have waited so long to move to exclude tobacco. The tobacco program has existed since 1954. As was stated by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and other Senators, tobacco has been a great revenue producer for the country.

Yesterday I pointed out to the Senate the losses from various commodities that are protected under the Agricultural Acts. Although tobacco is the greatest producer of revenue for the Government, the cost of the program by way of price supports under Public Law 480 since 1933 has been only \$374 million, while the cost of corn and other feed grains has been over \$10 billion. The cost of the wheat program has been over \$14 billion.

I hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will be agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator is not trying to make an analogy as between tobacco and edible feed grains.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not.

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot understand the argument. Why should tobacco be subsidized at all? Tobacco does not help anyone except the people who grow it and make a profit on it, and the people who smoke it. We have an abundance of evidence that tobacco is injurious to health. The Surgeon General has said so.

I think the Senator from Delaware weakened his own amendment when he included alcoholic beverages, because no one expected that that would be done. The Senator gave a sort of ridiculous tone to the amendment when he included alcoholic beverages.

After all, we could not, as moral people, say that the U.S. Government, under the pretext of feeding the hungry mouths of the world, was going to feed them by giving them alcohol. It should never have been included. And now we are compounding that error by excluding alcohol and including tobacco.

The Senator from Delaware made the argument that we never have used alcoholic beverages for that purpose in the first place. Why did he bring it up?

I am saying that part of the tobacco produced is sold for soft currencies. Part of it never gets back to the U.S. treasury.

This is merely an economic gimmick. We should recognize it. All we are trying to do by the Cooper amendment is help the tobacco growers. That is all. We are not feeding the hungry mouths or helping the underdeveloped nations. I think it is a pretext.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has said that it just helps the tobacco growers. Of course, it helps the tobacco growers, but it also helps the Government by the development of agricultural markets abroad. That will come. That helps this country in its trade, in its balance of payments, and it helps other countries. As my colleague pointed out, it gives them a commodity which is a revenue producer. We have had this provision since the Marshall plan. There was a provision to supply it to European countries. Now it is going to the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am a member of the Commerce Committee. Not too long ago we had protracted hearings on the causes of cancer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Who has control of the time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. How generous. Please, may I have 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. Make it 3.

Mr. PASTORE. Three minutes. We had protracted hearings and it was made abundantly clear—at least it was to my mind—so much so that we passed a law that there must be placed on every package of cigarettes, words to the effect that habitual use of those cigarettes is injurious to public health. Now here we are and here is a bill that I believe was conceived in morality. We are trying to feed the hungry of the world, and we are trying to palm off, in the process, tobacco in order to help the tobacco growers. This idea of supplying tobacco is, in the final analysis, not going to help them, but hurt the people. We put food in their mouths to help them live, and then we put tobacco, through cigarettes, in their mouths to give them cancer. That, I think, makes no sense.

I think both amendments give a ridiculous tone to this bill, and they should not have been started in the first place.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question so I may know about the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand it, the Cooper amendment would prevent giving away either tobacco or liquor under the food-for-peace bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Cooper amendment prevent the sale of tobacco or alcoholic beverages on long terms under the food-for-peace bill?

Mr. COOPER. Alcoholic beverages are out.

Mr. AIKEN. Alcoholic beverages are out, but tobacco may be sold under usual

terms, but cannot be given away. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I stand willing to yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Rhode Island asked why alcoholic beverages were mentioned. Yesterday when the question was first raised we were not able to get assurance that alcoholic beverages were not included. It was only after the amendment was submitted that we were told that alcoholic beverages never had been and never would be included in the future. So I modified my amendment accordingly to deal with tobacco and tobacco products only.

Tobacco products would not be given away under this bill. The Cooper amendment to the pending amendment really has no effect. It merely provides that we cannot do something which has never been done, and which would not be done anyway.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct that without the amendment they could be given away?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, but my amendment prohibits both gifts or subsidized sales. It is the subsidized sales that we are trying to eliminate. The adoption of my amendment would prevent subsidizing tobacco under the guise that we were helping alleviate malnutrition and hunger in underdeveloped nations.

I think the Cooper amendment should be rejected and the original Williams amendment should be approved.

The question is very simple—do we or do we not wish to subsidize the export of tobacco to these underdeveloped nations under the guise that we are helping them combat hunger and malnutrition?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURCK in the chair). All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator

from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 241 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alken	Hartke	Montoya
Allott	Hickenlooper	Morton
Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bayh	Holland	Mundt
Bible	Hruska	Nelson
Burdick	Inouye	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Proxmire
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Curtis	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Dodd	Long, La.	Sparkman
Dominick	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Ellender	McClellan	Talmadge
Ervin	McGee	Thurmond
Fannin	McGovern	Tydings
Fulbright	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Mondale	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—15

Boggs	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Clark	Lausche	Ribicoff
Cotton	Morse	Smith
Griffin	Muskie	Williams, Del.
Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—25

Bartlett	Cannon	Douglas
Bass	Carlson	Fong
Bennett	Case	Gore
Brewster	Church	Harris

Hayden
Jordan, Idaho
McCarthy
McIntyre
Metcalf

Murphy
Pearson
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Scott

Simpson
Smathers
Tower

So Mr. COOPER's amendment to the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, so that there will be no misunderstanding on the part of those who voted no on the last vote, I want the RECORD to clearly show that I am opposed to both tobacco and alcoholic beverages being the subject of gift or sale to underdeveloped countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a decision has been made on this question. I see no reason to have a vote on the substitute proposal. I ask unanimous consent that that may be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing on the Williams amendment, as amended. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I must express my deep concern for this legislation which authorizes more than \$7 billion over a 2-year period to supply U.S. farm products to foreign lands. It is my understanding that available for shipment under this program, among other commodities, will be corn, oats, sorghums, and all livestock feed grains. I am told that, technically, hay, also, could be sold and shipped as exports under this program.

Mr. President, West Virginia is now undergoing its fifth consecutive year of drought—a condition which has been described as the "worst drought in 46 years." Yet, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has steadfastly refused to approve any livestock feed to assist these farmers in caring for their dairy and

beef herds and other livestock. It would be a tragedy if we were to turn our backs on our own domestic needs to approve this food-for-peace legislation which, incidentally, I have supported in the past.

I feel that I should make this protest on the floor because my pleas for emergency livestock feed grain to assist West Virginia farmers have fallen upon deaf ears in the Department of Agriculture up to this moment.

How can our Government tell our farmers that we must ship these vital farm products to other countries when such farm feed grains are needed to assure food for our domestic requirements next year?

Because of the drought, which has exhausted livestock feed, the dairymen of West Virginia are selling their livestock at a rate 25 percent above the sales of last year. Does this not indicate that there will be less beef and less dairy products next year? Will there not be a shortage of food next year?

At my request, the Department of Agriculture sent an investigator to West Virginia for an on-the-scenes inspection of the drought. He returned with the report that some areas are bad, but before authorizing a Federal livestock feed program, he insisted on more written reports which are apparently still being reviewed. In the meantime, the farmers are feeding winter hay they were able to store for the livestock.

I am informed that this legislation authorizes the Department of Agriculture to spend over \$2.5 billion a year for 2 years, with the carryover from past authorizations of \$2.4 billion to assist in the purchase of these foods to be shipped to other countries.

It is difficult for me to believe that we are serving the country by refusing to assist our own farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD correspondence which I have sent to and received from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other areas of the executive branch. This correspondence and other matter will point to the very desperate need of farmers in West Virginia for participation in the emergency livestock feed program.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Charleston, August 30, 1966.

The Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Some time has passed since the meeting you arranged in your office with United States Department of Agriculture officials which I attended concerning the severe drought being experienced by West Virginia farmers. To the best of my knowledge, the United States Department of Agriculture has not released a report of their field investigation nor has there been forthcoming a word of encouragement to our people to help them in their planning for winter feeding as to grain supply or hay being made available to them. Some word of encouragement would be most timely because we are approaching another, what I term, critical situation. The rains of approximately ten days ago did put a green cast on our mountains and valleys and is

providing some additional grazing for livestock. This is, as stated before, only temporary.

Any assistance that you can give in this matter would be greatly appreciated by myself and the farmers of West Virginia.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

GUS R. DOUGLASS,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 26, 1966.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in reply to your letter dated August 18 and the wire dated August 12 from you and other members of the West Virginia delegation concerning emergency assistance for West Virginia farmers.

Last week a special representative of the Department surveyed the counties that were alleged to be hardest hit by drought in the State. While conditions in general may be considered somewhat less than normal at this season of year, they have not as yet really reached emergency levels sufficient to justify the Livestock Feed Program.

To counteract the loss of the full use of native pastures several weeks earlier this year than normal, grazing and haying privileges have been approved for all counties recommended for that program which includes 37 counties requesting the Livestock Feed Program. Dairymen interviewed invariably stated that they always purchased their grain requirements in mixed feed and the cow-calf producers and beef producers claimed they never could afford to feed grains.

The situation is being watched closely. The county disaster committees were requested last week to supply more current price data. When all possibility of pasture improvement has ended and we are able to evaluate more accurately the size of the corn crop and the benefits of the grazing and haying program previously approved, we will take action indicated by the established facts.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Acting Secretary.

AUGUST 18, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing today to seek your assistance in clarifying a situation which is becoming increasingly confused as a result of misinterpretations and brash statements concerning the applications filed by the West Virginia Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. These applications for the emergency Federal livestock feed program in 30-drought-stricken West Virginia counties were filed on the order of the West Virginia State Disaster Committee.

It is my understanding that the applications were filed on July 23, and August 5. As West Virginia farmers appealed to me for assistance to feed their diminishing herds of livestock, I talked with you by telephone. I also telegraphed you for assistance on August 10 and, as a reply was not forthcoming, I telephoned your office several times on August 11. Late in the afternoon on August 11, I received a telephone call from Mr. Ben Steele, Congressional Liaison officer for the USDA. On August 12, Mr. Steele informed me that a representative of the ASCS office in Washington would go to West Virginia for an on-the-scene study of the drought conditions. In our discussion, I was surprised to hear Mr. Steele make such statements as "these farmers only want subsidized feed programs." I was concerned to hear state-

ments of this type coming from a man who did not have first-hand knowledge of the situation and who acknowledged that the requests for assistance had come from USDA employees—the West Virginia State ASCS officers. I wonder now if that is the first response that the USDA makes to requests of this type.

As you undoubtedly know, a conference was called by me on this disaster situation on Saturday, August 13, at which Mr. Steele and representatives of the ASCS in Washington, as well as West Virginia, attended. Also present were representatives of the White House, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee staff for the Department of Agriculture, and West Virginia State officials. It was my judgment that this had been a fruitful meeting, that the ASCS men from Washington were willing to make their inspection in West Virginia with an open mind.

However, I am further concerned to hear that the investigator either was determined to hold the line against approving livestock feed programs at this early date or that he thoroughly misinterpreted the information received from farmers and livestock dealers in West Virginia. In a telephone conversation with a member of my staff, the investigator, I am told, acknowledged that "bad" drought conditions exist in four West Virginia counties.

He said that his investigation included a conversation with one man who runs a livestock auction center at Moorefield, Hardy County, West Virginia. He said this man told him that farmers in the area rarely buy feed grains at this early date. From this statement, the investigator concluded, and said outright, "I believe we have a power play going on there" to get the government-owned grains. He added another unbelievable statement to the effect that "You have too many millionaires in West Virginia."

Because these remarks again tended to contradict the appeals made to me by farmers in the drought-stricken counties and the statements of the West Virginia ASCS officials, a request was made of the Morgantown ASCS office for an explanation. These points were made by your employees at Morgantown:

1. The man who runs the livestock auction center at Moorefield may well have said that farmers rarely buy feed grains at this date. The ASCS officials at Morgantown agree that the grains ordinarily are not purchased before October. "But," they added, "this is the worst year we have ever gone through." They still maintain that the situation is so bad that the Federal feed grain program is needed *right now*.

2. Their reply to the comment about "millionaires" was "if there are any millionaire farmers in this area, we don't know where they are." Furthermore, they added, that farmers must show the need for Federal assistance and if any question arises as to this need, a financial statement may be required of the farmer by the ASCS before the feed grain program is applied to him. Farmers who cannot show this need are not allowed to participate in the Federal assistance program.

May I appeal to you now to take a hand in clarifying these obvious misinterpretations of statements by West Virginia farmers. It is difficult for me, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to observe the constant conflict in statements by ASCS officials in Washington and in the State of West Virginia.

I urge you again to approve the emergency feed grain program for farmers before irreparable harm is inflicted to the diminishing livestock situation in West Virginia.

With best wishes,
Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

[From the office of U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Washington, D.C.]

AUGUST 13, 1966.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today said it will send emergency livestock feed to drought-stricken West Virginia farmers and will send a special representative to the State on Monday to decide "when and where the assistance will be given."

This announcement was made by officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture during a special conference called on the plight of West Virginia farmers by U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD (D-W. Va.).

Attending the conference were officials of the White House, the U.S. Office of Emergency Planning, the USDA, the Senate Appropriations Committee and Gus R. Douglass, West Virginia State Agricultural Commissioner, Con Hardman, Administrative Assistant to Gov. Smith and Allen Miller, USDA representative at Morgantown, W. Va.

"Farmers in West Virginia tell me they are experiencing their worst drought in history and are selling their dairy breeding herds at a rate 25 percent above last year because they cannot feed them," said BYRD.

"At this rate, not only West Virginia but the entire country may experience a shortage of milk and other dairy products and beef next year. If we don't help the farmers now, we will feel the results in years to come."

BYRD said a questionnaire sent to farmers in Gilmer County indicated that 1,300 cattle have already been sold this year and another 4,874 are to be sold this fall.

Calhoun county has sold 768 dairy cattle, he said.

BYRD and Douglass asked for immediate approval of the USDA program which would make government-owned grains available to farmers as livestock feed at a cost of about 75 percent of market prices.

Thirty West Virginia counties have officially requested this assistance with 5 dairy counties needing it immediately, it was stated. Those five are Berkeley, Jefferson, Hampshire, Greenbrier and Marshall.

Douglass noted reports from livestock centers in the state which reveal that sales of cows are up 25 to 30 percent at Moorefield, Elkins, Point Pleasant, and Marlinton.

Finally, Charles Cox, assistant administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, stated, "We recognize that we must provide some assistance because there is no question that we have a distressing situation in West Virginia. Our only question is when and where it will go."

Robert Phillips of the Office of Emergency Planning acknowledged that disaster aid has not previously been used in a situation where livestock is still alive. He, too, agreed to study the situation further especially in cases where farmers need direct grants of hay for feed.

AUGUST 10, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

You will recall our telephonic conversation several days ago during which I urged extension of Federal assistance to West Virginia farmers for purchase of livestock feed. You indicated you would look into situation and call me back. I wish to renew my expression of concern regarding drought conditions in West Virginia. Assistance is needed as result of prolonged dry spell which has reduced crop production and will work hardships on cattle producers who do not have sufficient hay and grain to winter stock. Much livestock is being marketed because of lack of pasture and hay and grain crops and because of hay and grain shortage to be felt this fall and winter. It is unlikely that there will be any surplus hay for sale this year in much of West Virginia. Moreover, critical shortage of hay will result in increased prices. I again

urge favorable action at earliest moment and I await your reply.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in further reply to your telegram of July 19, 1966, requesting permission for farmers to graze and harvest hay on land retired by USDA programs in Barbour, Braxton, Doddridge, Grant, Greenbrier, Hardy, Kanawha, Lewis, Marion, Marshall, Monongalia, Nicholas, Pendleton, Pocahontas, Preston, Ritchie, Roane, Taylor, Tucker, Tyler, Wirt and Wood counties.

We are pleased to advise that authorization has been given to the county ASC committees to permit grazing and harvesting hay on Conservation Reserve, Cropland Adjustment, Cropland Conversion, Feed Grain and Wheat Diversion acres in the above West Virginia counties.

We wish to point out that farmers must obtain permission from their county ASC committee before using this acreage. In addition, farmers must agree to relinquish or refund or pay program payments otherwise determined for them, equivalent to the fair value of the vegetation to be grazed or harvested as hay.

No action is being taken at this time on the request for the Livestock Feed Program. If the drought continues, a Livestock Feed Program will probably be needed later but does not appear justified now.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and please feel free to communicate with us again at any time.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. REED,
Assistant to the Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING,

Washington, D.C., July 28, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This responds to your recent telegram requesting drought assistance for West Virginia.

The Department of Agriculture is in close touch with drought developments in West Virginia and has authorized certain emergency programs to aid drought-stricken farmers. These programs include haying and grazing on land diverted out of crops, and emergency conservation cost sharing assistance to restore pastures. We are unable to recommend further Federal assistance at this time.

Enclosed is a copy of our response to Governor Hulett C. Smith's request for emergency drought assistance.

Sincerely,

FARRIS BRYANT, Director.

Hon. HULETT C. SMITH,
Governor of West Virginia,
Charleston, W. Va.:

The President has asked me to respond to your telegram concerning drought assistance for West Virginia.

As you may know, we have been in close touch with the Department of Agriculture on this matter. We have been advised that the Secretary of Agriculture has authorized farmers in 30 drought-stricken counties to graze livestock or make hay on lands taken out of production under supply adjustment programs. This program has been approved for the following counties: Barbour, Berkeley, Braxton, Clay, Doddridge, Grant, Greenbrier, Hampshire, Hardy, Jefferson, Kanawha,

Lewis, Marion, Marshall, Mineral, Monongalia, Morgan, Nicholas, Pendleton, Pocahontas, Preston, Randolph, Ritchie, Roane, Taylor, Tucker, Tyler, Upshur, Wirt, and Wood.

Emergency conservation cost-sharing assistance also has been authorized in order to help restore pastures in six counties: Berkeley, Hampshire, Hardy, Jefferson, Mineral, and Morgan. USDA has allocated \$200,000 for agricultural conservation program (ACP) assistance in these areas.

The Department of Agriculture is maintaining close surveillance over drought developments in West Virginia in order to assure that the appropriate emergency agricultural programs are put into effect. Their USDA disaster committee in West Virginia is reporting to the Secretary on the situation and requirements for assistance.

At this point, there is no basis for us to recommend further Federal assistance. While serious drought conditions exist in West Virginia, we are advised that conditions are no less severe in a number of other States. The emergency programs of the Department of Agriculture are being made available to alleviate conditions in the drought areas.

Be assured that we shall continue to keep in close touch with developments in West Virginia through USDA authorities. I am hopeful that the situation will soon improve and that the emergency programs of agriculture will afford substantial relief for the drought-stricken farmers.

FARRIS BRYANT,
Director,
Office of Emergency Planning.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in reply to your telegram of July 19, 1966, requesting that Grazing and Haying be authorized in 21 West Virginia counties and the Livestock Feed Program in 10 counties.

We have not yet received the request and supporting data from the State USDA Disaster Committee. We appreciate your interest in this matter and assure you prompt consideration will be given to their report and recommendations.

We will advise you further as soon as the information is received and action taken.

Sincerely yours,

WILSON E. WESTBROOK,
Director,
Disaster and Defense Services Staff.

Secretary ORVILLE FREEMAN,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

Earlier this week I recommended to President Johnson and the U.S. Office of Emergency Planning that the State of West Virginia be declared a Disaster Area due to extreme drought conditions. While I still believe this total Federal emergency assistance is needed, until the proper requests are made and acted upon, I respectfully urge that you grant quick approval for stop-gap measures deemed vital to farmers in most West Virginia counties. These measures were requested Tuesday, July 19, by the West Virginia Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee. They include hay and grazing privileges on diverted acreage in 21 counties, in addition to the 8 counties where these privileges are already authorized; emergency conservation assistance in seven counties, in addition to the 6 where they have been granted; and authority to purchase Federal livestock feed in 10 counties. Pending full action for disaster relief,

I urge that you approve these requests as rapidly as possible.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 22, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in further response to your telegram of July 18 asking for emergency drought assistance for West Virginia farmers.

The Secretary of Agriculture is aware of the serious drought conditions in West Virginia. He has already authorized farmers in six counties to graze livestock or make hay on lands taken out of production under acreage diversion contracts. Emergency conservation cost-sharing has been authorized to help restore pastures in six counties. A study is under way to determine in which counties emergency operating loans should be authorized for farmers unable to get credit from other regular sources. USDA Disaster Committees in West Virginia are continuing to watch the drought developments and will make further recommendations if the drought situation worsens.

While the present drought conditions in West Virginia are severe, they remain considerably less severe than that which caused the President to authorize assistance in Puerto Rico. The Commonwealth Government had financed direct grants of feed to farmers in the drought area for several months before federal assistance was provided. Drought conditions there were so severe that several thousand cattle had died from starvation before federal assistance was authorized. The Commonwealth Government shared in the costs of this program and continued the program after federal aid was discontinued.

The drought situation in West Virginia will be diligently watched and appropriate actions will be immediately taken.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANATOS,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

JULY 18, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. FARRIS BRYANT,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May I respectfully urge that you consider the use of emergency disaster power for the serious drought situation in West Virginia. Our farmers in West Virginia are undergoing their fifth year of drought and many are heavily in debt due to this continuing emergency. Moreover, it has been estimated that the hay crop in my state will amount to only one-third the normal harvest. If this hay is needed now for livestock, how will the farmers feed their livestock this winter? I have been informed that emergency Presidential powers were used in Puerto Rico to buy animal feed during a three-month drought emergency last year. West Virginia has never before shared in the benefits of this emergency program, and I am informed it now has one of the best cases in the country to ask for assistance. Also, I am informed at this writing that no other state has requested drought emergency aid. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was pleased to be one of the principal sponsors of a motion to add \$10 million in supplemental funds last fall to assist in the flood disaster in Indiana. I have today urged Governor Smith to submit a formal request that West Virginia be declared a drought disaster area.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal,
Aug. 29, 1966]

DROUGHT IS WORST HERE IN 46 YEARS

The local drought in the months of May through July is the worst since 1920, nearly half a century ago, according to figures compiled by the Weather Bureau Agricultural Service Office in Kearneysville.

The figures for the past three months, the most important in the agricultural growing season, show only 3.64 inches of rainfall compared with 6.28 inches a year ago and 4.47 inches in 1930, a year that is always regarded the worst drought year in modern history. The normal for these three months is an even 11 inches.

The total rainfall for the first seven months of this year is 16.03 inches in contrast to 19.23 inches for the same period a year ago and to 22.37 inches for the first seven months of an average year locally.

What compounds the problem is the fact that this is the fifth consecutive dry year in the area. Last year's total rainfall was 29.97 inches in contrast to the average annual rainfall of 38.35 inches.

This section was doing very well for the first four months of 1966 when precipitation of 12.39 inches was slightly above the normal average but substandard totals for May, June and July brought about the acute situation.

It can also be added that the figures for August, unless there is an unexpected deluge in the next two days, will find conditions even worse. Thus far this month the rainfall measured at Kearneysville totals only 1.23 inches in contrast to 2.48 for the month a year ago and to 4.11 inches for an average August.

The Kearneysville station reports a 30-day weather outlook calling for three to four inches of rain but officials estimate another 10 to 12 inches are needed to return the soil to a healthy state.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from West Virginia in his protest against the policies and procedures of the Department of Agriculture in granting necessary relief to drought-stricken areas of the country.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it does not take a bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture to determine whether grass has dried up and there is not anything for cattle and other livestock to eat. It does not require any period of time to make that observation.

If the Department of Agriculture would place more faith in the people in the States to report that emergencies exist in their fields, there would be no need for the inexcusable delay that has been suffered across the country in the drought-stricken areas.

In the eastern part of my State, in the great cattle and sheep regions, we have the worst drought at the present time within the memory of the oldtime ranchers in that part of the State.

I join with the Senator from West Virginia in protesting the gross inefficiency and inexcusable delay on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, for he is the one that is responsible. He ought to pay more attention to the problems that exist

in our own country in regard to the need for a domestic aid program and come to the assistance of these farmers that are suffering from the great drought that encompasses a large part of our country this year.

I shall vote for the bill, but in voting for the bill it is no expression of confidence by the senior Senator from Oregon in the Secretary of Agriculture, for I have lost most of that confidence.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to read one sentence in the bill, on page 54:

No commodity shall be available for disposition under this Act if such disposition would reduce the domestic supply of such commodity below that needed to meet domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time of exportation of such commodity.

So that we are fully protected under the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, do I understand correctly, from what the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana has just said, that West Virginia farmers can be assured that no corn, hay, or other livestock feed grains will be sent overseas if there is a need for such grains in West Virginia and other parts of the country to relieve the drought conditions?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct about that. That is my understanding. Whether it will be done or not, remains another question. It has to be decided, as the Senator knows. The Governor of the State must declare the disaster and take some steps toward obtaining this assistance. As to whether or not the State or any county therein will be eligible for any part remains to be seen.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I should like to read one letter which came to me from the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of West Virginia, dated yesterday:

Some time has passed since the meeting you arranged in your office with United States Department of Agriculture officials which I attended concerning the severe drought being experienced by West Virginia farmers. To the best of my knowledge, the United States Department of Agriculture has not released a report of their field investigation nor has there been forthcoming a word of encouragement to our people to help them in their planning for winter feeding as to grain supply or hay being made available to them. Some word of encouragement would be most timely because we are approaching another, what I term, critical situation. The rains of approximately ten days ago did put a green cast on our mountains and valleys and is providing some additional grazing for livestock. This is, as stated before, only temporary.

Mr. President, I simply want to reiterate that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has moved all too slowly in responding to repeated pleas from me and other members of the West Virginia delegation and from West Virginia State officials to allow participation by West Virginia

farmers in the emergency livestock feed program. I shall vote for the food-for-peace legislation on which we are about to have a rollcall, but I shall do so under protest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for 30 seconds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The language read by the chairman of the committee provides no protection whatsoever. The language is there, but the only protection will have to take this form of action by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is where the protection is. Unless there is some way of forcing him to give the protection to the various areas of the country, the language that has been read is of no aid to the American farmer.

LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, to keep the record straight, I should like to review a minor piece of history relative to food for peace. In June of 1965 I introduced the international food and nutrition bill to supplant Public Law 480 as our surplus commodities declined. The bill was similar in scope to the food-for-peace measure now before us, although my proposal was somewhat more far-reaching and provided for greater effort to improve the handling and storage of food abroad.

For a number of years it has been clear that our food-for-peace program involves both a strong U.S. agricultural interest and a vital foreign policy interest. Recognizing this dual interest, the late President Kennedy created a special White House office on food for peace which I was privileged to head, that was designed to coordinate the two broad interests in our overseas food programs.

Cognizant of this dual agricultural and foreign policy involvement, I provided in my proposal last year for a White House Director to head the war on hunger. My bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, chaired by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. When the Senate reconvened this year, Senator ELLENDER, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, on which I am privileged to serve, suggested that the bill should be referred to his committee since it would greatly affect our domestic agricultural programs. He also argued with compelling logic that my bill would be viewed as a successor to Public Law 480 which had originated with the Committee on Agriculture.

I spoke to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and he urged me to request that my bill be transferred from his committee to the Committee on Agriculture. He explained that his committee was already heavily burdened with aid legislation and that in any event, my measure involved vital agricultural interests. He recommended that we follow the procedure advocated by Senator ELLENDER and consider such legislation in the Committee on Agriculture.

Pursuant to that discussion, on January 19, 1966, I requested unanimous consent, which was granted, to have the referral of the bill changed, stating that

after discussion with Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. ELLENDER, we "reached the conclusion that it would be more feasible for the legislation to be considered primarily by the Committee on Agriculture."

There was no objection.

In accordance with that referral, four other similar bills have been referred to the Agriculture Committee, including the bill now before the Senate.

Students of the legislative process may be a bit confused when they read the remarks of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee this week contending that the food-for-peace bill is a foreign aid bill and should have been referred to his committee.

Since my bill was transferred out of the Foreign Relations Committee after consultation and agreement with the chairman of that committee, his objection to the course of this bill does surprise me just a little.

I make this statement so that students and historians who someday research the course of our world food policy may know that as of January of this year, there was agreement that the legislative course which has been followed would be satisfactory.

CONTROL OF FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Agriculture Committee's report on H.R. 14929 makes it abundantly clear that the Secretary of Agriculture must be the key administration official in directing the food-for-peace program within general policy guidelines laid down by the President. Language is included in the proposed bill which makes it crystal clear that the Secretary of Agriculture is to make the decisions regarding the amounts and kinds of commodities that are to be made available in total and, in addition, that he is to determine the quantities of commodities to be included in negotiations with each country. It is this provision that gives the Secretary of Agriculture primary control of the program.

In the report and in previous discussions on this matter, our committee has placed emphasis on the fact that this responsibility properly must rest with the Secretary because of his responsibilities for domestic farm programs. I would like to discuss that point and to add another which has to do with the expertise, the demonstrated record, and the objectives of the Secretary of Agriculture and his people in the Department which uniquely qualify them because of the broader considerations included in the law.

We propose removing the surplus concept from the law. This is as it should be. We have long passed the point where we should regard Public Law 480 as a surplus disposal program. But this does not mean that we want to short consumers in the United States or endanger our commercial markets in the world because we have failed to plan properly for the requirements of the food-for-peace program. Take, for example, the recent decisions to increase wheat acreage allotments for the 1967 crop. Responsibility for making that decision rests with the Secretary of Agriculture.

In deciding that acreage should be increased, the Secretary had to take into account the need of consumers in the United States and the needs of our dollar customers abroad, as well as the requirements of the less developed countries of the world. Further, he had to come to a judgment as to the amount of carryover that we need to have in order to protect these vital requirements for the future. Should the Secretary arrive at the wrong decisions, should his decisions result in our producing too much or too little, he must face the consequences of the decisions. Therefore, it is this intimate tie-in with our domestic farm interests, that is reason enough for retaining control of this program in the Secretary of Agriculture.

But more than that, the Secretary of Agriculture has other responsibilities. The Secretary of Agriculture, the people in his Department, and the entire agricultural community in the United States have demonstrated over the years that they have other unique qualifications and the right kind of objectives which indicate where responsibility for the program should be vested. This is especially true because of the new self-help provisions in the program.

What this proposed bill now says is that the hungry nations of the world should no longer count on the United States filling the gap in their requirements which they should fill through their own efforts. It says that a judgment should be made as to the steps recipient countries should take on their own to improve their own agriculture in order to qualify for our commodities. This is a concept which above anyone else in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture has been pushing and promoting ever since he took office. Let me give you some evidence in this respect. For many years the largest recipient of food assistance, India, gave its food grain producers disincentive prices and wondered why they were not getting the desired production. Within the last 2 years, the Indian Government recognized that cheap food to consumers meant low returns to producers and that the continuation of the policy would always be self-defeating. They substantially increased returns to producers for wheat and other food grains within the last 2 years, and this is one of the reasons why there is more optimism about their ability to solve their own problem in the future. Who pushed the Indians to this action? It was the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the leadership of the Secretary. He sent a team of USDA officials to India who persuaded the Indians that this was the real solution to their problem.

Then there is the matter of the priority treatment that agriculture receives in the total economic development programs of the less developed countries. It has been quite clear for some time that many of these countries have refused to give agriculture the priority it deserves when the local funds and the aid funds were being distributed to the various sectors within the economy. Agriculture generally wound up as the low man on the totem pole.

Again speaking of India, this policy has been reversed. I am sure all of you have read in the paper recently about this reversal coming about in the new 5-year program which has been announced in India. Again, it was the Secretary of Agriculture who prodded and pushed and pleaded with the Indians to make this reversal. I think it is common knowledge that the President of the United States asked the Secretary of Agriculture to take the lead in this matter and he has gotten the job done.

And that brings up another point. Who was it who focused attention on the problem of hunger in the world? Who was it who said to us time after time that unless we deal with the problem of hunger in the world, there can be no real solution to the ills of the world? Again, it was the Secretary of Agriculture with the help of his people in the Department. The first studies produced by the U.S. Government in recent years highlighting this problem were those issued by the Department of Agriculture under the leadership of Orville Freeman, the so-called food gap studies. These have received attention not only in the United States but in the entire world.

Let us talk about objectives for a minute, and let me add to that the demonstrated record as well. I know of no achievement of the United States that is regarded so highly around the world as the production miracle on the farms and ranches of the United States. While most of the world, including the Communist areas, struggle to get their agricultural house in order, this country has truly achieved a production miracle. Nowhere in the world is more attention focused on how to get our free enterprise farming system to produce more efficiently. In no other place is so much effort expended in trying to get two bushels out of an area where one grew before.

The leadership, the drive, and the heart of this effort is centered in the Secretary of Agriculture, the Department, and in our land-grant college system. These are the resources which we must use if we are to solve the problem of hunger in the world.

The achievements of American agriculture are also recognized around the world in the area of commercial exports. There was a time in our history when we imported more agricultural commodities than we exported. There also was a time when our trade balance in agriculture had improved to the point where it exceeded our agricultural imports but where we still earned less from our dollar exports of farm commodities than the cost of our agricultural imports. But this is no longer true. Under the leadership of the Secretary of Agriculture, our exports have steadily mounted. Today, our overseas shipments are not only at an alltime record of almost \$7 billion, but we are earning well over a billion dollars a year more through our commercial farm product exports than our total agricultural import bill. This means that American agriculture is helping to solve our balance-of-payments problem. And, again, the official responsible for this action, I repeat, was the Secretary of Agri-

culture. It is the changes in our domestic farm programs, our expanded market development program, our push on trade barriers in other countries which have made this record possible.

I might add, parenthetically, that some years ago we were concerned about the threat to our poultry trade in the EEC. Who was it who led the fight against the erection of these unfair barriers? It was Orville Freeman, not the State Department. It makes sense to put responsibility for this program in the hands of the Cabinet officer and the Department who have led the way to this great expansion in our farm product exports. They are the people who should decide whether the making available of commodities under the food-for-peace program deters our market or promotes them.

In short, what I am saying is—control of this program has always been with the Secretary of Agriculture. It must stay where we know that the judgments, the expertise, and the objectives give the best promise for successful administration of this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is: Shall the bill pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN],

the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 242 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Hartke	Moss
Allott	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Muskie
Bayh	Holland	Nelson
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Boggs	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Robertson
Cooper	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McClellan	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Talmadge
Ellender	McGovern	Thurmond
Ervin	Miller	Tydings
Fannin	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Monroney	Yarborough
Griffin	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morton	

NAYS—2

Lausche Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—24

Bartlett	Fong	Murphy
Bass	Gore	Pearson
Bennett	Harris	Randolph
Brewster	Hayden	Russell, S.C.
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	McCarthy	Simpson
Church	McIntyre	Smathers
Douglas	Metcalfe	Tower

So the bill (H.R. 14929) was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives there, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. COOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the past 3 days the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has pressed vigorously for passage of the food-for-peace measure. Its overwhelming acceptance by the Senate today demonstrates once again the already

proven talents of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Senator ELLENDER has consistently devoted his tireless capacities and able advocacy to legislation vital to our national interest. The outstanding achievement today was no exception. So we are again grateful for his unrelenting efforts, his astute advocacy, and particularly for his profound understanding of the food-for-peace program.

Commendation goes also to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for assisting to obtain the Senate's decisive support on this measure. Also, to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking minority member on the committee, we are grateful for typically able support.

To other Senators go our thanks for joining to assure this magnificent success. I note particularly the articulate assistance of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] whose clear explanations of some of the bill's features aided its adoption immensely.

Others are to be commended for their cooperative efforts. Specifically, our thanks are extended to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for urging his own strong and sincere views without impeding the progress of the measure unreasonably.

Again to the entire Senate I am personally most indebted for the cooperation received by the leadership in obtaining action today. It is my hope that in the days to come we will continue to see the kind of cooperation which will enable the swift and orderly disposition of the remaining legislative proposals.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 112) to amend the Consolidate Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans by the Secretary of Agriculture on leasehold interests in Hawaii, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 17419) to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PATRICK V. McNAMARA FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1508, S. 3748.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3748) to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, briefly I want to express my appreciation to the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle for permitting us to act so quickly on this proposal.

I shall not delay its passage by making a long statement. Those of us who knew and loved Pat McNamara—and that includes every Member of this body and their staffs—are delighted even in this small way to demonstrate for a long time to come our appreciation of the many contributions that Pat McNamara made to his State and Nation.

I would hope that Pat McNamara would regard this tribute as not being inappropriate memorial to him. I know that he would be most uninterested in eulogies but because he was a builder—indeed, because he was a building tradesman, and proud of it—I would think that all of us now are proposing a memorial which will serve not only the people whom he served and their descendants, but will also fittingly memorialize Pat McNamara.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my heartfelt support for this legislation which designates that the new Federal building in Detroit shall be known as the Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building in memory of the late Senator McNamara.

Senator McNamara was an exceptionally fine individual, a man of great personal integrity and devotion to all that he believed was right. He was a man of no pretensions, a man who never engaged in shame. This is the kind of moral fiber of which great men are made.

It is with reverence for the spirit of Pat McNamara that I express my support for this legislation conceived to do him honor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3748

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Michigan, shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a distinguished member of the United States Senate from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966. Any reference to such building in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building."

AMENDMENT OF ACT INCORPORATING AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 17419.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill (H.R. 17419) coming over from the House. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill (H.R. 17419), to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein was, by unanimous consent, read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the bill is very much desired by the American Legion while they are still assembled in convention in the Nation's Capital. It merely amends the charter granted to it by Congress to enable veterans serving in Vietnam to become eligible for membership.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I heartily concur in the amendment of the act. The bill should be passed, because the men serving in Vietnam should be enabled to join the American Legion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 17419) was, by unanimous consent, read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 17419) was passed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee reported this morning an identical bill (S. 3784). I ask that that bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 3784 will be indefinitely postponed.

ENDANGERED SPECIES OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1443, H.R. 9424.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9424) to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife including migratory birds that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "economic"; in the same line, after the word "growth", to insert "and development"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "that", to strike out "the United States has an obligation pursuant to international agreements such as the Migratory Bird Treaties and the Inter-American Treaty on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation, 1940, with Canada and Mexico and other countries" and insert "the United States has pledged itself, pursuant to migratory bird treaties with Canada and Mexico and the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere"; after line 20, to insert:

(b) It is further declared to be the policy of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Defense, together with the heads of bureaus, agencies, and services within their departments, shall seek to protect species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction, and, insofar as is practicable and consistent with the primary purposes of such bureaus, agencies, and services, shall preserve the habitats of such threatened species on lands under their jurisdiction.

On page 3, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "species", to strike out "or subspecies"; in line 9, after the word "the", to insert "affected"; in line 13, after the word "assistance", to insert "In addition to consulting with the States, the Secretary shall, from time to time, seek the advice and recommendations of interested persons and organizations including, but not limited to, ornithologists, ichthyologists, ecologists, herpetologists, and mammalogists. He shall publish in the Federal Register the names of the species of native fish and wildlife found to be threatened with extinction in accordance with this paragraph"; on page 4, line 17, after the word "extinction", to insert "Not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be appropriated annually pursuant to that Act or any other Act for such purpose for any fiscal year, and the total sum appropriated for such purpose shall not exceed \$15,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended. The Secretary shall not use more than \$200,000 to acquire lands, waters, or interests therein for any one area for such purpose unless authorized by Act of Congress"; on page 5, line 6, after the word "Act", to insert "and shall consult with and assist such agencies in carrying out an endangered species program"; after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 3. In carrying out the program authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall cooperate to the maximum extent practicable with the several States, and he may enter into agreements with the States for the administration and management of any area established under this program for the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of threatened species of native fish and wildlife. Any revenues derived from the administration of such areas under these agreements will continue to be subject to the

provisions of section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715s).

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 3. (a) In carrying out the program authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall cooperate to the maximum extent practicable with the several States. Such cooperation shall include consultation before the acquisition of any land for the purpose of conserving, protecting, restoring, or propagating any endangered species of native fish and wildlife.

(b) The Secretary may enter into agreements with the States for the administration and management of any area established for the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of endangered species of native fish and wildlife. Any revenues derived from the administration of such areas under these agreements shall be subject to the provisions of section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715s).

On page 7, line 5, after the word "accommodations", to insert "when, and in such locations, and to the extent that the Secretary determines will not be inconsistent with the primary purpose for which the affected area was established"; in line 17, after the word "System", to strike out "Provided, That the lands or interests therein so exchanged shall involve approximately equal values, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged." and insert "The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal to the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require."; on page 9, line 1, after the word "regulations.", to insert "The provisions of this Act shall not be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations in any area within the System."; in line 8, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "system" and insert "System"; in line 19, after the word "of", to strike out "migratory"; on page 11, after line 10, to insert:

(1) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

And, on page 14, after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) The first sentence in section 1 of the Act of August 22, 1957 (71 Stat. 412; 16 U.S.C. 696), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1. In order to protect and preserve in the national interest the key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, and donations, including the use of donated funds, such lands or interests therein in townships 65 and 66 south, ranges 28, 29, and 30 east, Monroe County, Florida, as he shall find to be suitable for the conservation and management of the said key deer and other wildlife: *Provided*, That no lands within a one thousand-foot zone adjacent to either side of United States Highway Numbered 1 in Monroe County shall be ac-

quired for the Key Deer National Wildlife Refuge by condemnation. The Secretary, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may accept title to any non-Federal property in townships 65 and 66 south, ranges 28, 29, and 30 east, Monroe County, Florida, and in exchange therefor convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require."

(b) The second and third sentences of section 3 of the Act of August 22, 1957 (71 Stat. 413; 16 U.S.C. 696b) are repealed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the members of the Committee on Commerce, Republicans and Democrats alike, deserve the thanks of the American people for bringing this legislation to the floor of the Senate as a part of a series of bills which are designed to protect and propagate certain native species of fish and wildlife indigenous to North America.

It is a shame, Mr. President, that many of the species of birds and mammals indigenous to this North American land mass have been exterminated. The proposed legislation would provide the means, I think, to halt this process of extermination, and to protect those species whose remnants yet remain.

The California grizzly bear proudly stands in the center of the flag of my State of California. This powerful animal once roamed our Sierra Nevada Mountains, but is now extinct.

Among the famous animals which now live only in our folklore are the passenger pigeon, the Carolina and Louisiana parakeets—the only members of the parrot family native to the continental United States—the eastern elk, the Badlands bighorn sheep, and both the California and the Texas grizzly bear.

I recognize and commend the devotion with which special efforts to save endangered species have been made by Federal, State, and local governments and by private conservation groups. Without such vigorous efforts the whooping crane, the trumpeter swan, the Kodiak bear, the American buffalo, the fur seal, and a host of other valuable animals would have vanished long ago. But such an approach, however effective in isolated situations, is not the most effective or efficient solution to a problem as diverse as this.

Again, I commend the members of the Committee on Commerce for their action on this bill and I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] in commending the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON], for presenting this proposed legislation and for the careful work that was done by the committee.

I should like to add to that, however, that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who serves on the Committee on Commerce, was deeply

interested in this legislation. He held and presided over the hearings which were rather extensive, and he was active in helping prepare and present a careful and effective bill. I think that I should have mentioned this in addition to the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire for his courteous statement. I think that this can be a very important and a very good bill. I am delighted that we are able to clean up some of the more far-reaching provisions so that we can have some protection not only for the endangered species but also for the American taxpayers.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when our country was founded its forests were teeming with wildlife and its streams had an abundance of fish. These natural resources have diminished as our society has become industrialized, and certain native species of wildlife and fish, as well as migratory birds, are now threatened with extinction. H.R. 9424 would provide for conservation and protection of these animals to insure their survival. I urge that this legislation be passed that future generations may enjoy the wildlife which was so essential to their forefathers.

H.R. 9424 allows the Secretary of the Interior to consult with the States to determine which species of fish and wildlife are endangered and to carry out a program of conservation. Funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 may be used to acquire land for these purposes. Up to \$5 million may be appropriated annually; the total sum cannot exceed \$15 million. The conservation areas and wildlife ranges will be designated as the national wildlife refuge system and will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States.

This bill affords us the opportunity of protecting fish and wildlife which may otherwise be destroyed. The buffalo and whooping crane have been the unfortunate victims of industrial development. Let us preserve our remaining species of fish and wildlife whose educational and historical value is so great. I urge passage of H.R. 9424.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MERRITT A. SEEFELDT AND
AUGUST C. SEEFELDT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1475, S. 1572.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1572) for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time and passed as follows:

S. 1572

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt of Clark, South Dakota, are hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$539.73, representing the amount assessed against them for alleged quality deficiencies in wheat which was delivered by the said Merritt A. and August C. Seefeldt in settlement of the price support loan (number 47-013-173A) made to them by the Commodity Credit Corporation in carrying out the 1962 price support program for wheat.

CONVEYANCE OF MINERAL INTEREST IN CERTAIN LANDS ACQUIRED FOR THE VEGA DAM AND RESERVOIR, COLBRAN PROJECT, COLORADO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1506, H.R. 399.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 399) to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Vega Dam and Reservoir is located on the Colorado River at Collbran, Colo. It is part of the Collbran reclamation project which was authorized by the act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 325), at a total estimated cost of \$16,086,000.

In order to permit construction of the Vega Reservoir, the principal storage facility of the project, the Department of the Interior determined that it was necessary to acquire approximately 1,963 acres of the land. Land acquisition and construction were commenced in 1957.

The committee was advised that at that time the joint policy of the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army for land acquisition on reservoir projects was that mineral, oil, and gas rights would not be acquired when the owner objected. The committee has been advised that nevertheless in the Vega acquisition the owners were told that acquisition of all mineral interests was necessary. Despite the fact that at least two of the owners had indicated a desire to retain their mineral interests,

the Department of the Interior in 1957 acquired the lands involved and obtained fee title, including all the mineral interests.

Mineral rights in any land acquired in fee would therefore be acquired with the land unless the owner objected or unless their purchase would entail substantial additional costs. Even in these excepted instances—owner objection, high cost—the mineral rights would be acquired if development of the minerals would interfere with project operation.

The May 27, 1957, contract with the Collbran Conservancy District, the landowners' organization that contracted to repay the costs of the project, provided in section 7(a) that "the—Collbran Conservancy—District shall, at its own expense, negotiate for the purchase of all lands and interests in lands needed by the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project works, using for that purpose appraisals made and approved by the United States, forms of contracts, deeds, and other necessary papers furnished by the United States." Such an arrangement has been used from time to time in reclamation project land acquisition programs. It was thought that having local supporters of the project negotiate for the land rather than Government personnel would produce more harmonious relationships. There was no formal manual of instruction for such local representatives. Contacts were made on an informal basis between the district officials and the Bureau of Reclamation's project engineer.

The eight tracts were appraised in late 1956 and early 1957 by a board of appraisers made up of three reputable local citizens with realty appraisal experience and familiarity with real estate values in the project area.

Some of the lands were acquired under direct purchase contracts and some were acquired by the filing of declarations of taking in condemnation proceedings.

In 1959, one of the owners who had contracted to sell his property and had transferred his mineral interests to the United States was advised that there had been a change in policy, that mineral interests were no longer being acquired for the property but that the Secretary of the Interior was without authority to reconvey the mineral interests. However, action was taken by the Attorney General to revest the mineral interests in the former owners in those cases where title had vested in the United States in condemnation proceedings.

The effect of this was that those who cooperated and negotiated the sale of their property, ended up divested of their mineral estate; while those whose property was acquired by condemnation proceedings, were allowed to retain their mineral estates. Such results are patently unfair. In order to correct this inequity I introduced S. 1464, a companion measure to H.R. 399, which will provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior similarly to make adjustments, through reconveyance of mineral interests to the former owners of lands, whenever the Secretary shall determine that

the retention of the mineral interests is not required for public purposes.

The committee concluded that it made no difference whether the former owners, who entered into direct purchase contracts and had sought retention of their mineral interests, had been denied this privilege, contrary to the general policy, or whether there was, as stated by the regional office, a change in policy during the real estate acquisition program. In either event, it was further concluded by the committee, the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir project should be uniform and the former owners, who had entered into direct purchase contracts, should be restored as nearly as possible to the position they were in prior to the execution of the contracts. Accordingly, H.R. 399 provides for the reconveyance of the mineral interests at the amount determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal to the price of which such mineral interests were acquired by the United States.

The Department of the Interior advised the committee that, of the 1,964 acres acquired for the project, mineral interests are still retained in 1,151 acres.

H.R. 399 and its companion measure, S. 1464, introduced by me provides the Secretary of the Interior with the authority necessary to make adjustments in interests in land acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Colo., through reconveyance of mineral interests to former owners. This will make uniform the estate acquired to fulfill the necessary real estate requirements of the project. The mineral interest would be transferred for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price at which it was acquired by the United States.

It will grant to the Secretary the necessary authority to correct an inequitable situation. My colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] joins me in urging passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 399) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

"R. N. BERT DOSH LOCK" END OF CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1507, H.R. 790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 790) to rename a lock of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal the "R. N. Bert Dosh lock."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1498 (H.R. 9918). I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9918) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair can have the attention of the majority leader, is it his intention to consider Calendar No. 1498, H.R. 9918, a bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, that will be the pending business, but no action will be taken until after the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], who has been so kind and gracious in yielding time on other matters, has concluded his remarks on the subject of the brain drain from developing countries.

THE BRAIN DRAIN FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in past months we have seen widespread evidence of the growing gap which separates the wealthy nations of the West from those in Asia, Africa, and Latin America where the struggle for survival is a daily ritual.

World Bank President George Woods has compared our per capita income of \$3,000 with the \$120 average in 40 of the world's poorest countries. And even more foreboding, he estimates that if present trends continue, the American figure will rise by \$1,500 before the year 2000, while income in the poorest nations will increase only \$50 per person.

Mr. President, we can look only with the deepest concern on the threat which this poses to world peace for our generation, and for the generations to come. President Johnson pinpointed this danger when he said 2 years ago:

I do not believe that our island of abundance will be finally secure in a sea of despair and unrest or in a world where even the oppressed may one day have access to the engines of modern destruction.

To narrow this gap, or at least to keep it from growing, has become one of the major objectives of U.S. foreign policy. We pursue this objective with the sober realization that unless present trends change, food riots in India may prove but a prelude to the mass uprisings which will follow throughout the world.

Yet in our approach to this problem, we have almost ignored one of the major

forces accentuating the gap between rich and poor—the brain drain from talent-hungry young nations to the technologically advanced countries, above all, the United States.

There are, of course, many brain drains.

There is the movement—adversely affecting my State—of many of the best brains from the Midwest to California and the east coast. There is the migration of scientists and other professional people from Britain and Western Europe to America. In fact, our Nation was built by a sort of brain drain from Europe, and the West was won through the movement—we might call it a brawn drain—of some of the toughest, brightest and most ambitious residents of the east coast. And many centuries ago, there was a brain drain to Rome from the outlying provinces.

But without denying the importance of the others, I feel that the brain drain from developing countries is particularly urgent. It compromises our commitment to development assistance, by depriving new nations of high-level manpower indispensable to their progress. It runs counter to the education and training programs which are so vital in our foreign aid.

In the words of Assistant Secretary of State Charles Frankel:

It is one of the steady, trying, troublesome diplomatic issues confronted by [our] government . . . one of the most important problems faced not just by the Department of State, but more important, by the United States and by mankind as a whole.

I believe that the time has come to take a hard look at the brain drain.

We must examine its scope and its effects.

We must ask whether our immigration policies and education programs serve to intensify the brain drain.

We must consider whether the causes of the brain drain lie in the developing countries themselves, and if they do, how our aid program can be forged into a major instrument to attack these causes.

We must carry out more research on the brain drain, for our lack of detailed knowledge hinders efforts to combat it. But we must also consider concrete actions to slow it down.

Let us first look at the facts we do know.

The brain drain is serious among scientists. The National Science Foundation estimates that, between 1956 and 1963, 2,858 scientists and engineers from South America moved permanently to the United States. In the same period, 4,114 from Asia did likewise.

The brain drain is severe and growing among doctors and health specialists. Dr. C. Halsey Hunt, executive director of the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates, reports that 10,974 of the 41,102 residents and interns serving in American hospitals are graduates of foreign medical schools, three-quarters of them from developing countries. They may originally plan to return. But their experience here best fits them to remain in America, and is often ill suited to the needs of their

homelands. So a conservative estimate is that 20 to 25 percent stay.

The brain drain is acute among foreign students. In an article in the July Foreign Affairs, Cornell President James A. Perkins cites an estimate that—

Over 90 percent of Asian students who come here to study never return home.

Immigration and Naturalization Service statistics indicate that 30 percent of Asians who come here on student "F-visas" adjust their status to permanent resident. Whatever the exact figures, the nonreturn of students to Asia is of massive proportions, particularly severe for countries such as Taiwan, Korea, and Iran.

We can be pleased that the brain drain is not acute in AID-sponsored training programs. More than 99 percent of participants return home when their programs are completed; indeed, they must pledge to work there at least 2 years putting their training to work.

Yet while AID was bringing from Asia, Africa, and Latin America some 16,493 trainees from 1962 to 1964, during this same period 8,151 other students from these same areas adjusted their status to permanent U.S. resident. Only half as many, perhaps, but for each man that left, a developing country lost an educational investment of many years, while the AID training averaged 9 months.

Thus, the brain drain among students more than cancels out one important phase of our foreign assistance programs.

These statistics establish beyond doubt the severity of the brain drain. But they do not show that those who leave developing lands are, all too often, men of the very highest potential.

Imagine how different American history would have been had we been deprived of such men as Benjamin Franklin, John Quincy Adams, Ralph Waldo Emerson, the elder Oliver Wendell Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and J. Robert Oppenheimer, all native Americans who studied or received training in Europe during their early lives.

This may make it easier for us to see what developing nations may be losing every year, and why Charles V. Kidd of our Office of Science and Technology calls the loss of scientists "a national catastrophe" to developing countries, since they have so few to build a base for scientific and technological progress.

The need for doctors is even more acute. Nigeria, with one-fiftieth as many doctors per person as the United States, graduated 19 physicians in 1963 from its 1 medical school—at the same time 16 Nigerian doctors were serving as residents and interns in U.S. hospitals. The Philippines, with health conditions still much worse than our own, graduates 1,010 doctors a year, and provides us 2,108 residents and interns. In the teeming city of Hong Kong, there are long lines in the streets of people waiting to see the doctor, and many are known to have died before their turn has come.

As one human example, Gregory Henderson of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research tells of the

death of the young wife of a Korean friend. Her disease was curable; her husband came from his village's richest family. But there was no doctor to diagnose her illness, just as there are no doctors in over half of Korea's counties. Like over 20,000 others in the world each day, she died because the doctor was not there.

Under other circumstances we might rejoice that the torch on our Statue of Liberty, lighting the way for the oppressed in the last century, has today become a beacon attracting men of highest caliber from all over the world. Were our objective simply to siphon off the world's most talented people—to draw them to the United States—we would consider the brain drain an unmixed blessing.

But in today's world it is barely a mixed blessing. It may be a brain gain for us in the short run, but it threatens one of the paramount longrun objectives of American foreign policy, progress in underdeveloped lands.

For as Secretary McNamara said in his remarkable speech at Montreal, "World security—and American security—depends on development in these countries development at sufficient speed to satisfy at least a portion of their rising aspirations."

Since the brain drain threatens development, it is ultimately a threat to the security of our own land.

The brain drain is the sum of thousands of individual decisions, decisions by talented, trained people to leave their home countries. These are not decisions lightly taken. We must realize that the student, or scientist, or doctor from a developing nation faces a unique kind of pressure. He is expected to serve as a bridge between two cultures, to apply the knowledge and technology of the West as a working member of a radically different society. Any effort to reduce the brain drain must provide him help and support, and increase his prospects for a rewarding professional life in his homeland.

A brain drain program must be selective, focusing on those nations and occupations where the problem is most acute.

Some countries, which lose 50 to 95 percent of their students studying abroad, could probably not put all of them to effective use, though they could benefit from a substantially higher rate of return. In other countries, the brain drain may not be a major problem.

And certain skills may not be in demand. Many African countries have a limited need for atomic physicists, for example, and some Africans mastering this field may be best employed outside their homelands.

A brain drain program must be undertaken without doing violence to the spirit of the 1965 immigration legislation ending the discriminatory "national origins" quota system, legislation which I was proud to cosponsor.

A brain drain program must be humane, recognizing the importance of uniting families, and providing refuge to many cut off from their homelands for political reasons.

A brain drain program must recognize that not all of the drain from developing countries is to the United States. Our efforts in this area must be coordinated with our allies, for we do not want to reduce the drain to the United States only to increase it in equal measure to Canada and Western Europe.

A brain drain program must recognize that, in a number of important areas such as medicine, the United States has very serious manpower shortages. And if we would not turn our backs on the needs of others, neither can we ignore our own needs.

But when all the necessary qualifications are made—and they are necessary—the fact remains that the brain drain is an international problem of the first magnitude, and a problem which we have hardly begun to deal with.

There are, in my view, at least five areas where action is urgently needed.

First, we must expand our research on the brain drain, in order to know better its magnitude and its causes.

There is certainly a brain drain. Yet estimates of its extent vary widely. Dr. Perkins writes that 90 percent of Asian students do not return—INS figures indicate about 30 percent. The true figure may lie somewhere in between, but it is important to know where, and in what countries, and, more difficult, for what reasons. Nor are our statistics much better for doctors, or other professional groups.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service can make an important contribution here. It is the only agency which keeps records on all of the individuals who come to the United States. It has already furnished some valuable information on students adjusting their status to permanent resident.

But more is clearly needed. We need the figures on adjustment of student status over a much longer time period, as well as adjustment of others on temporary visas. We need a breakdown on skilled immigrants by profession from each developing country, something which is not now available. I hope that INS will find it possible to undertake these tabulations.

Research on the underlying causes must be undertaken mainly by private scholars, and much of this is already underway. The Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs provided a shot in the arm by sponsoring a conference of scholars on the brain drain in June. The Council is now compiling a bibliography to stimulate future research.

But though more knowledge is urgently needed, we know enough now to provide the basis for concrete action.

So, as my second suggestion, I feel we must substantially expand educational opportunities for Americans in areas like medicine where we are now seriously dependent on manpower from developing countries.

Dr. Hunt, whose statistics I cited earlier, writes:

If the 11,000 foreign graduates who are now occupying internships in United States hospitals were suddenly withdrawn, many United States hospitals would be forced to curtail sharply their services to patients. I

submit that for the long run this is a completely untenable situation.

The situation is not only untenable—it is a national disgrace. The growing shortage of medical and health personnel has been evident for many years. That the United States should, in the face of such clear evidence, depend increasingly on doctors from developing countries to make up for our insufficient number of medical graduates is inexcusable.

In the long run, there can be only one decent answer—we must sharply increase the output of our medical schools. Then, when we welcome foreign interns and residents on exchange programs, we can concentrate not on filling the gaps in our medical manpower, but on providing them with skills and experience which will increase their capacity to serve their own people.

Like many Senators, I have often been asked to work for admission of foreign doctors to the United States to serve communities in my State which desperately need them. These doctors have served us well. I shall continue to work for their entry in cases of clear urgency, for I feel an obligation to help my constituents to meet their medical needs.

But this is all the more reason to attack the root of the problem—the shortage of doctors and nurses, and the urgency of training more today to meet the demands of tomorrow.

Medicine is the most crucial area, but in other professions we are also severely dependent on the brain drain. It is disturbing to note an estimate by a Labor Department economist that, over the next decade, 1 out of every 11 new professional workers in the United States will be an immigrant. I certainly appreciate the impressive contribution that immigrants have made and will make to our national development. But I am troubled by the one-way character of the permanent flow, and by the picture of the richest nation in the world, with some of the finest educational institutions, following a continuing policy of draining professional manpower from countries whose rapid development is strongly in our national interest.

As a third step, I think we should encourage our colleges and universities to reshape programs for foreign students in this country—not just those under government sponsorship—to make these programs more relevant to the needs of their homelands.

A large part of the brain drain, as we have seen, is among young people who come here to study and, then decide to change their status to that of permanent resident.

In opening their doors to these students, our colleges and universities perform a national and international service of the first order. But they face a difficult paradox—the better their foreign students adjust to university life, the longer they extend their periods of study, and the more successful they are in pursuing them, the more likely they are to want to remain permanently in the United States.

To resolve this paradox, we must shape programs for foreign students which

orient them toward the needs of the developing nations to which we hope they will return.

Therefore, I would urge that the Federal Government inaugurate a program of pilot grants to educational institutions, to support development of new curriculums to relate the education of foreign students to the problems they will face on returning home. The authorization under the Fulbright-Hays Act would, I understand, be broad enough to support funding of such programs. Or it might be preferable to amend the International Education Act, once that program gets underway, to accomplish this aim.

As an example how this idea might be applied to the field of law, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of my recent speech to the Federal Bar Association in Edina, Minn., be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

MR. MONDALE. Such an effort would help to remedy the present imbalance in official concern about the brain drain problem. For understandable reasons, Federal efforts to reduce it have been predominantly directed toward students directly sponsored by our Government, though the Interagency Council on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the State Department, have recently begun to concern themselves with the brain drain among nonsponsored students as well. But the major problem is precisely with this nonsponsored group, and I feel we must help our universities make a start in dealing effectively with it.

We should also provide more funds to help universities strengthen their foreign student counseling services. This should include increased efforts to help the student maintain contact with developments and opportunities in his homeland, a very important element in his decision to return.

Such services for nonsponsored foreign students were endorsed by both the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees in their 1961 Reports on the Fulbright-Hays Act.

As a fourth approach to the brain drain problem, I believe we must give far more attention to helping developing countries make effective use of the skilled people they have.

For while we spend hundreds of millions on education and training of foreign citizens, and then drain many away to meet our own needs, developing countries thirst for skilled, professional manpower, and often do not provide good opportunities for the people they already have.

Dr. George P. Springer, associate dean of the Yale University Graduate School, has said:

As a university person, I find it difficult to advise an engineer from India who is offered a \$10,000 a year job here or in Canada to go back to his country, where there is a high risk that he will be a clerk-typist for the next ten years.

This may overstate the general situation, but there is ample evidence to support the conclusion of Professor George Seltzer of the University of Minnesota that the brain drain "may be symptomatic of a host of fundamental shortcomings regarding the development and utilization of high-level manpower. Seltzer adds:

The wastage of those who stay may be as great or greater than those who leave.

Part of this problem may be in the proportions of skilled people; a country may have too many scholarly scientists and not enough engineers.

But at the root is the lack of effective economic and social institutions to attract the right man to the right job, to award posts on the basis of potential capabilities rather than personal connections, and to allow a talented young man to advance as fast as his abilities merit.

We are not without this problem in America, but it appears to be far more severe abroad, in countries far less able to afford it. Until this fundamental and neglected problem of manpower utilization is met in developing countries, there will continue to be a severe brain drain no matter what else we do.

That is, of course, primarily the responsibility of the developing country itself—so is the whole question of economic development. But our AID program should make this problem one of its major areas of concern.

Part of the answer may lie in promoting diversity and pluralism in young nations, so that talented individuals can establish their own businesses, or found their own schools, or run their own co-operatives—so that they will have a chance and an incentive to develop their talents and to test them in the crucible of experience, rather than serve time in some stifling bureaucracy. As David Bell has written in the latest issue of *Foreign Affairs*:

There is now ample evidence and a growing consensus supporting the proposition that those countries will develop faster which rely most heavily on multiple sources of private and local initiative and energy—in contrast to countries which rely most heavily on central direction and control.

Much of the answer, I feel, lies in better placement systems for professional talent.

One experiment, with mixed success so far, has been India's Scientists' Pool. Under this program, Indian scientists are guaranteed temporary placement when they return to their country, thus giving them time to shop around for suitable permanent employment without worrying where their next rupee is coming from.

Much can be accomplished by opening recruiting and placement offices in America to offer concrete opportunities to foreign students concluding their study here. The Ford Foundation has just granted \$200,000 to an Indian business group called "Assist" to support a job-placement office in New York.

Developing countries might also be encouraged to establish national service corps—similar to our VISTA and Peace Corps—to involve returned students in national service work. Built into these

corps should be serious efforts to evaluate capabilities of members so they can move into permanent jobs equal to their talents.

Such service corps could be organized to welcome the talents of those who, for political reasons, were unable to return to their particular homelands. For example, an Argentine barred from return by the recent coup could work in another South American nation, contributing his much-needed skills to development.

There are other alternative possibilities. But what is vital is to focus far more effort on the neglected problem of the effective use of talent and skills, one of the most difficult and crucial that developing countries face.

Finally, we should look into the possibility of negotiating bilateral agreements with developing countries severely affected by the brain drain, to modify the effect of our visa and immigration policies.

This is an area where we must tread with extreme care.

As one who cosponsored the bill to end our national origins quota system, I would not want us to violate in any way the spirit of the new immigration act. Yet the increased emphasis on the skills of the immigrant, regardless of his origin, clearly exacerbates the brain drain problem. And already we are seeing its effects.

In fiscal year 1965, under the old law, 54 Indian immigrants came to this country under the preference category for professional and technical workers and their families. In that same year, 51 such immigrants came from Korea. But with the reallocation of unused quota numbers provided by the new law 1,750 Indians in this category, more than 32 times as many, were admitted 1 year later, together with 400 Koreans under the same classification.

There is also the related problem of adjustment of visa status. We have already seen that, of the thousands of Asians who come here to study under student "F-visas," about 30 percent change their status to that of permanent resident.

And I am told that the new law makes it easier for students to do so, by making it unnecessary for them to gain endorsement of university authorities when they apply.

Because of the severity of these particular problems, combined with the importance of maintaining the general provisions of our immigration law, I think we should explore the chances for bilateral agreements with particular developing countries to deal with the problems as they arise in each national case.

Such agreements might provide that all students coming here from a particular country enter on exchange visitor visas, which provide that the visitor return to his homeland for 2 years before becoming eligible to apply for permanent immigration.

Such agreements might establish a mechanism for considering the needs of a particular developing country in our immigration policy, as well as our own needs. It might be possible to set up some sort of binational "immigration

review panel" to consider individual cases. Also, the United States might commit itself to honor restrictions on passports issued by the developing country, designed to make them invalid for immigration purposes.

Any such bilateral agreement, I believe, should provide that the developing country take specific, concrete steps to remove root causes of the brain drain by increasing opportunities for talented individuals.

We cannot pretend that such agreements would involve no restrictions on the freedom of the individual who wishes to come to our shores. Yet no one is advocating today an open American immigration policy; the question is rather who shall be admitted, and who shall be kept out.

We have determined, as one basic principle, to place high priority on our need for skilled people. I feel that it is essential to find some way to consider another principle, the manpower needs of countries whose development is a goal of our national policy.

In other words, what is needed is some way to strike a balance.

And a balance is what is needed in many other action areas I have discussed. Our people do need doctors, as our economy thirsts for more scientists and engineers. We prize the presence of foreign students on our campuses. We profit from the contribution of immigrants from all continents to our national life.

Yet, if we would build a world where our children can live in peace and freedom, development of poor nations must likewise receive high priority in our national policies.

And if we continue to neglect the brain drain, and present trends continue and accentuate, we may reap a grim harvest in the fulfillment of the Biblical prophecy:

To him that hath, it shall be given; from him that hath not, it shall be taken away, even that which he hath.

The gap between rich and poor will continue to widen, and hopes for lasting peace will vanish for our century.

I hope and believe that this outcome can be avoided. With the combined efforts of our Nation and those in other lands, I believe that it can be.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE, TO FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA, MAY 13, 1966

The other way to solve the problem of developing a good base of lawyers for the developing world is to bring them here for education. Not so they can learn to duplicate our institutions, but to gain the skills to create their own appropriate ones.

There is an opportunity for a very exciting program here, truly tailored to the needs of the new nations.

President Johnson has proposed an International Education Act which would set up centers for Advanced International Studies in some of our universities. Those centers may concentrate on a particular geographical area, or on a specific set of problems in international affairs.

If this Bill becomes law, and I certainly support it, there would unquestionably be

centers specializing in the whole range of problems of the developing world.

I suggest that there should be an entire program for foreign lawyers set up by our leading law schools, taking full advantage of the resources of the Centers for Advanced International Studies.

Harvard Law School has made a start with its course on the Tax Policies of Developing Nations. But a whole program should be devised, with appropriate legal education complemented by study in the economic, social, and political problems of developing nations.

Special courses in legislation, taxation, sociology, public administration, foreign exchange, land and water resources, and similar subjects could be featured.

As such programs become realities, there would be an important role for you here to play. These students should learn something of the practice, not just the theory, of law before returning to their countries.

Individually or as an association, you could establish programs for internship, and could place these students for summer employment in your private or governmental law offices. This would be of incalculable benefit to these students.

Such an educational program may seem a far cry from the issues of war and peace. But only after individual efforts bear fruit, when the rule of law is established in the developing world, will the right climate exist for the kind of international cooperation we all want.

Then we really will have been friends to the new nationalism, and it will be all to our good.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 17419) to amend the Act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein, and it was signed by the Vice President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18 POSITIONS FOR USE IN CERTAIN AGENCIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2393) to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965, which were,

to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (j), (k), and (l) of this section, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to establish and, from time to time, revise the maximum number of positions, not to exceed an aggregate of twenty-seven hundred positions, which may be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule at any one time. Such number of positions shall be in addition to—

"(1) any professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine which may be placed in such grades, and

"(2) two hundred and forty examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1010) which may be placed in grade 16 of the General Schedule and nine such positions which may be placed in grade 17 of the General Schedule."

(b) Section 505(c) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(c)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(c)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The Librarian of Congress is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by this section, to place a total of thirty-five positions in the Library of Congress in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grades."

(c) Section 505(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(d)), relating to additional positions for the General Accounting Office in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule, is amended by striking out "thirty-nine positions" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy positions".

(d) Section 505(e) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(e)), relating to additional positions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule, is amended by striking out "seventy-five positions" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and twenty-five positions".

(e) The Act entitled "An Act to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes", approved May 29, 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402, note), as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out, in section 2 thereof, "sixty-five such officers and employees" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy-five such officers and employees"; and

(2) by striking out, in section 4 thereof, "sixty civilian positions" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety civilian positions".

(f) Section 3301 of title 39, United States Code, relating to personnel requirements of the postal field service, is amended by striking out "salary levels 18, 19, and 20" and inserting in lieu thereof "salary levels 19 and 20".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for additional positions in certain departments and agencies, and for other purposes."

Mr. MONRONEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Mon-

RONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. FONG conferees on the part of the Senate.

MAILING PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES AND OTHER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL OVERSEAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13448) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. FONG conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Gerald A. Brown, of California, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for the California Debris Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Miles S. McKee, of Michigan, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas S. Francis, of Maryland, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ivan L. Bennett, Jr., of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Environmental Science Services Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity to be senior Air Force member of the Military Staff Committee, United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc, and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc, and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE AIR FORCE, IN THE ARMY, IN THE NAVY, IN THE MARINE CORPS, IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, in the Army, in the Navy, in the Marine Corps, in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMENTS OF SENATOR MURPHY REGARDING THE RETIREMENT OF GEN. BERNARD A. SCHRIEVER

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY

I wish to associate myself with all those distinguished Americans who pause this day to salute General Bernard A. Schriever. General Schriever today ends a truly great military career in the United States Air Force.

We in California have come to know the General well. After World War II and the Korean conflict, the Soviet Union challenged

our country with intercontinental ballistic missiles, feats in space and in the air. Our country needed a man to head its program to meet this formidable threat.

General Schriever heeded the call taking the reigns of the several Air Force agencies concerned with the development and production of a mighty retaliatory force. He came to California to direct his country's efforts and his success is legend. I need not recount here his dramatic achievement with the Atlas, Titan and Minuteman programs. His subsequent tenure as Commander of the Air Force Systems Command has added further to his great record.

General Ben Schriever has achieved much in his yet young lifetime. It is certain he will continue to make manifold contributions as a civilian in his chosen field. He carries with him the profound gratitude of his country.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL TEACHERS CORPS— A RETREAT FROM HOPE?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word—and I shall be brief—about the National Teachers Corps. I have been visited by a considerable number of wonderful young men who have been trained for the National Teachers Corps. They came to see me, as well as other Senators, from various universities. These young men paid their own way. They are dedicated to their work. They have sought this opportunity to serve the poor through the National Teachers Corps, which gives bright promise, like the Peace Corps and like VISTA. We know that it is badly needed in the war on poverty.

There were 10,000 applicants who were attracted to the National Teachers Corps, but now we find ourselves—because there have been no appropriations made by Congress—with a remnant of 1,600 once eager teachers, who, having finished their special training, now have no place to go.

The program was launched with considerable promise. Congress authorized \$36.1 million for its first year. The administration requested less than half that amount—\$13.2 million—and finally \$9.1 million was appropriated, with tight restrictions on its expenditure.

With this money, the National Teachers Corps went about giving special training to 1,616 teachers to go to needy, poverty schools. Now, funds are needed for the current year to pay these teachers to put their experience and their enthusiasm to work as contemplated by U.S. investment in their training.

For fiscal year 1967, \$64,715,000 is authorized, and the administration requested \$31,372,000, which would have resulted in putting some 3,000 teachers in the field in slum schools, and another 750 in training.

Unfortunately, the other body did not include any money for the National Teachers Corps in the Labor-HEW appropriation bill which was approved by that body on May 5, and which is still pending before the Appropriations Committee in the Senate. If the Senate does not act affirmatively, the National Teachers Corps will become a broken promise to the slum child, and a shattered dream for the dedicated young people who have volunteered to step into the front lines as teachers in the fight against poverty.

The Senate has a real responsibility in this matter. I express the earnest hope that it can be met. We cannot, with logic, adopt a multibillion-dollar antipoverty program and then let the National Teachers Corps die.

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization is holding hearings on the cities, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], as to how urgently this kind of dedication is needed.

Here it is, right at hand, in this situation. If only they could be given a little money to take care of it.

I express the earnest hope that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate considering the matter may enable something to be done. We must answer the cries for help which we are hearing in a situation with which the whole country is confronted.

I know of no more worthwhile program than the National Teachers Corps. I commend it highly to the Appropriations Subcommittee hearing and hope that it will act on it affirmatively.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO AS SENATE DOCUMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82) to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents which was, after line 12, insert:

SEC. 3. The Public Printer is authorized to accept from the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico an amount equal to one-half of the total cost of printing incurred under this concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 243 Leg.]

Anderson	Jackson	Nelson
Bible	Javits	Pastore
Burdick	Kuchel	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Mansfield	Prouty
Clark	McGovern	Proxmire
Dominick	Montoya	Ribicoff
Ellender	Morse	Tydings
Griffin	Moss	Yarborough
Gruening	Mundt	
Hill	Muskie	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. [Putting the question.]

The motion is agreed to, and the Sergeant at Arms is directed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morton
Allott	Holland	Neuberger
Bayh	Hruska	Robertson
Boggs	Inouye	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Saltonstall
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Cotton	Lausche	Stennis
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Symington
Dirksen	Long, La.	Talmadge
Dodd	Magnuson	Thurmond
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fannin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hart	Mondale	
Hartke	Monroney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3005) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents involving motor vehicles and to reduce the death and injuries occurring in such accidents.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3052) to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8989) to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13284) to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II—in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9918) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today the Senate addresses itself to one of the most pressing problems facing the District of Columbia today—the problem of how to cope with the rapidly rising number of uninsured motorists now cruising the streets of the District daily, inflicting countless thousands of dollars damage on innocent pedestrians, motorists, and property owners without the slightest ability to pay for the damage they do.

Existing law in the District of Columbia is hopelessly inadequate to deal with the uninsured motorist problem. That law allows any uninsured motorist to kill, injure, or maim an innocent pedestrian or motorist before the law even applies to him. Amendments to that law were proposed by the insurance industry, to impose more stringent penalties on an uninsured motorist who caused accidents, and are still totally defective in this regard. They allow the uninsured motorist to “one bite,” to destroy one life, to cripple a child, to kill a breadwinner, to mangle a mother. Last February 24, for example, a 42-year-old father of five was struck by an uninsured motorist in the District of Columbia while he was crossing the street as a pedestrian. The uninsured driver was charged by the police for failure to yield the right of way. But this was no compensation to the injured man who lost 6 months’ wages, with fractured legs and hips—and had to pay medical bills in the thousands—for the driver who struck him was uninsured.

Less than a year ago an uninsured motorist ran through a red light in the District of Columbia and struck a husband and wife who were traveling through the intersection in their automobile. Both victims are still out of work because of their injuries. Both suffered severe fractures and disfiguring cuts. The wife received brain damage. But neither one of them will ever collect a dime for their injuries, because the uninsured motorist who hit them has no assets to pay for his wrongdoing. Three years ago, an uninsured 28-year-old struck a pedestrian while crossing

Georgia Avenue, fracturing both of the victim’s arms and legs, and rendering him totally and permanently blind. That victim also remains without any compensation for his injuries, because the motorist who hit him was uninsured and insolvent.

A week later, an uninsured motorist struck three parked cars in the District, killing a 38-year-old mother, who left a 7-year-old son and a husband, whose job in the construction trade does not allow him enough money to employ a substitute mother. Neither the father nor the child has ever received a cent for the heartache and financial loss that uninsured motorist caused them because he has no assets.

These are not rare cases. These cases occur hundreds of times a year in the District of Columbia. Neither present law nor the amendments to it which the insurance industry proposes will stop this kind of case, because both present law and the proposed amendments to it allow an uninsured motorist one accident such as those I described before he becomes subject in any way to the law. H.R. 9918, the bill we are considering here, will provide some remedy to these poor, hapless people who have no other recourse and whom present law and the insurance industry-proposed amendments to it do not help.

The purpose of the bill is to protect the 815,000 residents of the District of Columbia from financial loss due to the negligent operation of the tens of thousands of uninsured motor vehicles now registered in the District of Columbia.

I think it important that the Members of the Senate realize that in considering this bill they are legislating as a city council, for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

The bill would provide protection in two ways:

First, it would require the inclusion of an uninsured motorist clause in all automobile liability insurance policies issued on vehicles registered in the District. The uninsured motorist clause would provide insurance protection to the policyholder and members of his family anywhere, anytime, and to others when occupants of the insured’s vehicle against financial loss due to the negligence of an uninsured motorist.

Second, the bill would require any uninsured motorist, as a prerequisite to automobile registration, to pay \$40 into an uninsured motorist fund, out of which limited amounts may be paid to uninsured victims of the negligence of insolvent uninsured motorists.

In short, H.R. 9918 will provide a source of compensation for the victims of financially irresponsible motorists. A companion measure, S. 1713, which has also been favorably reported, will provide no such compensation but will impose more severe penalties on uninsured motorists who have accidents than present law provides.

THE NEED FOR THIS BILL

The 27,000 motor vehicle accidents which occurred in the District of Columbia last year injured 7,800 persons.

More than 12,000 of these accidents involved uninsured motorists. As a result, between 900 and 1,200 of the accident victims remain uncompensated for their injuries, because the drivers who caused them were uninsured and insufficiently solvent to make legal action against the drivers for damages financially worth while.

Existing law in the District of Columbia provides absolutely no protection to motorists, their families, their passengers, or to pedestrians and property owners against financial loss from the negligence of financially irresponsible, uninsured motorists. The so-called Safety Responsibility Act passed by the Congress in 1955 does not require a financially irresponsible motorist to obtain automobile liability insurance until after he has killed or injured an innocent victim and has failed to satisfy a court judgment against him for his negligence.

Moreover, although insurance industry spokesmen in 1954 predicted that the passage of the present Financial Responsibility Act would result in the insurance of 90 percent of the vehicles registered in the District, it appears that the existing law actually encourages financial irresponsibility on the part of many District motorists. Indeed, the number of motor vehicle owners in the District who are insured at all has never reached 90 percent and has actually declined 19 percent in the last 2 years alone, from 86 percent of all registered owners to approximately 67 percent. Nearly one-third of all motor vehicle owners in the District of Columbia—driving about 61,000 vehicles—are now uninsured.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that the argument which was presented by the insurance industry in 1954, and which will be presented now by those representing their interests, that all that need be done to combat this problem is to have a stiffer financial responsibility law, just does not hold water. They said that in 1954. They said, “When you pass the present District of Columbia financial responsibility law, 90 percent of your automobile owners will insure their cars.”

That has not been true. As a matter of fact, the number of motor vehicles registered in the District which are now insured is all the way to 67 percent. Once it was as high as 86 percent.

Moreover, existing District legislation allows an uninsured motorist who has an injury-causing accident to begin driving again after 1 year, even if he is still uninsured and still insolvent, unless the injured party has filed suit for damages against him.

Since a reasonable person will not bear the trouble and expense of a suit against a negligent driver known to be both uninsured and without assets to pay a judgment, existing District law permits the uninsured and insolvent motorist chance after chance to injure others, but provides no way to compensate those injuries. In fact, 2,000 of the 12,000 uninsured motorists who were involved in accidents in the District of Columbia last year had had at least one known

previous accident and some had had two or even three.

To prevent the financial tragedies caused victims of uninsured, insolvent motorists, a broadly based group of District of Columbia organizations drafted the bill your committee now reports. This bill is the product of years of study and many months of drafting by the District of Columbia government in close cooperation with the District of Columbia Bar Association, the District of Columbia chapter of the American Automobile Association, the Citizens Traffic Board and the Government Employees Insurance Co., the largest carrier of automobile liability insurance in the District of Columbia than all other insurance companies combined. The bill also carries the endorsement of the Metropolitan Board of Trade.

Four full days of hearings on this bill and alternative bills were held by the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee last year.

Your committee is convinced that H.R. 9918, as passed by the House, represents a sound approach to answering the grave problem of financial irresponsibility among uninsured motorists in the District of Columbia.

Enactment of H.R. 9918 will supplement existing law by providing a means by which the victims of uninsured motorists can be compensated for their injuries when the uninsured motorist is insolvent.

HOW THE BILL OPERATES

H.R. 9918 combines the best features of the laws of 28 States to provide a sound financial basis to protect the victims of uninsured motorists from financial loss.

The bill provides programs of protection similar, but superior to those now established by law in Virginia and Maryland, the District of Columbia's neighbors, for the protection of their citizens from financially irresponsible motorists.

Under the bill, a person wishing to register a vehicle in the District of Columbia would have two alternatives. He could purchase a policy of insurance containing the usual public liability and property damage coverage, plus an inexpensive clause protecting him, his family, and his passengers against the negligence of uninsured motorists. If he declined to purchase such insurance, he would have to pay \$40 into the unsatisfied judgment fund established by this bill to compensate the victims of uninsured, insolvent drivers against whom the victims have secured a court judgment.

THE UNINSURED MOTORIST CLAUSE

The bill provides that every policy of automobile liability insurance issued on a motor vehicle registered in the District of Columbia must include an "uninsured motorist" provision insuring the owner of the vehicle and his family at all times and in all places, whether driver, passenger, or pedestrian, against injury by uninsured motorists. In addition, the uninsured motorist provision must also insure any nonmember of the insured's

family when a driver of/or a passenger in the insured's motor vehicle.

Twenty-five States now require such provisions to be offered in all motor vehicle liability policies issued in those States. Several States including Virginia, require such clauses. The uninsured motorist clause this bill would require would cost a nominal—\$4 to \$8—but actuarially sound amount.

The limits of coverage provided by the uninsured motorist clause would be identical to the maximum amounts recoverable from the unsatisfied judgment fund created by the bill:

First. A maximum limit of \$20,000 for all injuries or deaths arising out of a single accident. Within the \$20,000 overall limitation, any individual might recover a maximum of \$10,000.

Second. A maximum limit of \$5,000 for all property damage arising out of a single accident.

By requiring the inclusion of the uninsured motorist provision in all insurance policies issued on motor vehicles registered in the District of Columbia, the bill provides an actuarially sound program of insurance for most District residents against uninsured motorists. It also helps insure the solvency of the "unsatisfied judgment fund" that persons not covered by an "uninsured motorist clause" must look in case they cannot collect a court judgment obtained against an uninsured motorist whose assets are insufficient.

THE UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT FUND

The "unsatisfied judgment fund" is, then, an essential complement to the uninsured motorist clause in providing the public a minimum financial protection against the depredations of negligent uninsured motorists. The "unsatisfied judgment fund" created by this bill guarantees the victim of a negligent uninsured motorist that, if the motorist proves to have insufficient assets to satisfy a court judgment, the judgment can be paid, at least in part, from the fund.

The limits of recovery from the unsatisfied judgment fund are equal to the protection provided by the uninsured motorist clause required in insurance policies under the bill.

The "unsatisfied judgment fund" will be financed by a charge assessed against any uninsured motorist who seeks to register a car in the District of Columbia. The charge can be adjusted administratively so as to insure the solvency of the fund. Your committee estimates that a charge of \$40 for every uninsured motorist who hereafter seeks to register a car in the District, producing a fund of \$2,440,000 under present conditions, will be sufficient to assure the solvency of the fund for the foreseeable future.

Further assurance of the solvency of the fund is provided by the following limitations in the bill:

First. Only uninsured persons injured by an uninsured motorist's negligence, who obtain a judgment against that motorist, can claim against the fund. No one covered by an "uninsured motorist clause" can also claim against the unsatisfied judgment fund. His sole—but equal—recourse is against his own in-

surer. Nor do uninsured motorists have any recourse against the fund.

Second. No person otherwise eligible to claim against the unsatisfied judgment fund may do so until he has first sought and obtained judicial judgment of liability against the uninsured motorist and has made all reasonable efforts to collect the amount of that judgment and has failed to do so in part or in whole due to a lack of assets of the judgment debtor. Thereafter, the uninsured motorist's victim may recover the unpaid portion of his judgment from the fund, up to the limits provided by this bill.

UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT FUND NOT INSURANCE

The unsatisfied judgment fund is not insurance, nor is it a substitute for insurance for the uninsured motorist, who must contribute to it. The sole and limited function of the unsatisfied judgment fund is to provide a source of protection for uninsured passengers, pedestrians, and property owners against financial loss from the negligence of uninsured and insolvent drivers. No other proposal suggested to this committee provides that protection, or any protection for the residents of the District of Columbia against uninsured motorists, who kill, injure, or maim them.

SELF-INSURER EXEMPTIONS

Your committee took special note that the definition of "uninsured motor vehicle" in section 3(r) specifically exempts vehicles owned by holders of certificates of self-insurance under the Interstate Commerce Act. The committee was advised that this exclusion includes D.C. Transit, the Greyhound company, the Trailways company, and the North American Van Lines. Therefore, these interstate common carriers are not subject to the provisions of H.R. 9918.

However, the effect of the exemption on vehicles owned by these carriers does not preclude their passengers residing in the District of Columbia from being fully protected by this bill. Although D.C. Transit, as the major passenger carrier in the Washington metropolitan area, is exempt from the provisions of this bill, it is required to meet the self-insurer requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act providing protection for judgments rendered against it.

INSURANCE INDUSTRY-PROPOSED BILLS ARE INADEQUATE TO MEET THE UNINSURED MOTORIST PROBLEM

The insurance industry has proposed two bills, S. 1713 and S. 1714, to deal with the uninsured motorist problem in the District.

H.R. 9918, the bill your committee now favorably reports, includes the best features of S. 1714, but leaves off its defects. S. 1713, which is a useful complement to H.R. 9918, has been separately reported by the committee.

S. 1714 would require each motor vehicle liability insurance policy in the District to include an uninsured motorist clause, but would give every insured motorist the right to reject that clause as part of his policy. The uninsured motorist clause is a worthwhile feature of motor vehicle insurance. Its inclusion in

every policy of motor vehicle liability insurance issued on an automobile registered in the District of Columbia is required by H.R. 9918, which your committee favorably reports.

But S. 1714 would provide no protection for the families, passengers, and person of an insured motorist who rejected the extra coverage of the uninsured motorist clause. Far worse, this insurance industry bill would under no circumstances provide any protection against uninsured motorists to the great number of District of Columbia residents who own no motor vehicle and cannot be covered by any known form of automobile liability insurance.

S. 1713, the second insurance industry-sponsored bill, would amend the present District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act. Because the committee believes S. 1713 may serve as a useful compliment to H.R. 9918, by decreasing the number of uninsured motorists, it has unfavorably reported it separately. However, S. 1713 is no alternative to H.R. 9918. S. 1713 merely makes more burdensome some requirements of the existing law without remedying in any way the existing law's basic defect. For under both existing law and the insurance industry's proposed amendment to it, an insolvent uninsured motorist can have one accident which kills or injures one or more innocent persons before he is required to demonstrate any financial responsibility as a prerequisite to driving.

Neither industry-proposed bill, S. 1713 or S. 1714, would require any contribution from uninsured motorists for the protection of the public, such as the unsatisfied judgment fund H.R. 9918 would create. The insurance industry proposals, taken together or separately, perpetuate the certainty that District residents will be killed or maimed by insolvent uninsured motorists, just as they are today.

Thus, the industry-sponsored bills, like existing law, places a premium on irresponsibility and discourages the most irresponsible drivers from obtaining insurance. Why should an irresponsible, insolvent motorist pay for any insurance if he knows that a suit against him for his possible negligence would be worthless and thus most likely not undertaken? By contrast, H.R. 9918, the uninsured motorist bill, makes suit against the uninsured motorist worthwhile, by providing a fund from which judgment in the case can be satisfied if the defendant proves insolvent. As the likelihood of suit against the uninsured motorist increases, with the costs and trouble for the defendant such suits entail, the incentive for the uninsured to obtain insurance increases.

Moreover, H.R. 9918 also provides an incentive to the more responsible uninsured motorist to obtain insurance, since all insured motorists will have to contribute to the unsatisfied judgment fund. If one must pay \$40 merely for the privilege of driving while uninsured, why not instead pay another \$40 or \$50 to buy a policy of insurance which will protect him as well as the public?

WHAT THE BILL WILL COST

The administration of this bill will not require expenditure of any appropriated funds.

The inclusion of the "uninsured motorist clause" in insurance policies issued on automobiles registered in the District will cost insurance companies nothing, since that clause, like any other, can be merely written into the insurance contract as an actuarially sound cost—about \$4 to \$8 a year. All policies now issued in Virginia must include such clauses.

The cost of administering the unsatisfied judgment will be paid out of the fund itself. No tax dollars will be spent for this or for any other purpose provided by this bill. Estimates place the annual administrative cost, payable from the fund, at approximately \$195,000 per year.

The District's experience has been that when an innocent victim is hit by an uninsured motorist who is judgment-proof, because he has no assets to meet a judgment, the innocent victim will not go to the expense of a lawsuit, because there will be no assets to meet a judgment.

Look what has happened. Two thousand of the twelve thousand uninsured motorists involved in an accident last year were persons who had been involved in an accident before under the existing financial responsibility law.

To prevent the financial tragedy caused victims of uninsured motorists, a broadly based group of District of Columbia organizations has spent many months drafting the bill which the committee now favorably reports. The pending bill is the product of several years of study and many months of drafting, not to mention weeks of hearings in my subcommittee. It was drafted by the District of Columbia Government in close cooperation with the District of Columbia Bar Association, the District of Columbia Chapter of the American Automobile Association, the Citizens Traffic Board, and the Government Employees' Insurance Co., the largest carrier of automobile liability insurance in the District of Columbia. The bill carries the full endorsement of the Metropolitan Board of Trade.

We held 4 complete days of hearings on this bill and alternative bills proposed by the insurance industry.

The District of Columbia Committee is convinced that H.R. 9918, as passed by the House of Representatives, represents a sound approach in answering the grave problem of financial responsibility among uninsured motorists in the District of Columbia. Enactment of H.R. 9918 will supplement District of Columbia law by providing a means by which victims of uninsured motorists can be compensated for injuries when those uninsured motorists prove insolvent.

Mr. President, there is an unusual legislative history to this bill. It was passed by the House of Representatives over the objections of the House District of Columbia Committee. The House of Representatives was so persuaded by the merits of this legislation that its Members took the unique step of overruling a committee which had supported, in my

judgment, a completely weak and ineffective insurance industry bill. The House of Representatives overruled the District of Columbia Committee and passed this bill, we are now considering, which would give some protection to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The legislative fact is that we must pass the bill as the House passed it without amendments, if we are to have any type of decent financial responsibility legislation to protect the citizens of the District of Columbia, because if we were to amend it and send it back to the House, the conference committee would be controlled by Representatives who, without question, would see to it that the bill was killed.

One of my responsibilities on the District of Columbia Committee is to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce.

I can assure any Senator who has a meritorious amendment—and there may be some—a full hearing, and an opportunity to add such amendments to the financial responsibility law next year, assuming we enact this legislation into law.

The bill is as it stands, however, a thoroughly sound approach to this grave problem facing the District's residents.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. How big a problem? Mr. TYDINGS. A problem which, as I indicated, some 2 or 3 years ago caused a young man 32 years of age—

Mr. DOMINICK. I heard that parade of horrors recited by the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. A young man 32 years of age lost the use of both arms, the use of both legs, and the eyesight of both eyes. The young man, 32 years of age, will never have the use of his eyes again throughout the rest of his life, and yet will never have any compensation whatsoever from the man who destroyed his life.

There is the case of the insolvent and uninsured young man who struck three parked cars and in the process killed a young 38-year-old mother, leaving a 7-year-old boy and his father who had neither the means nor the time to substitute for the mother.

I can give the instance of a 37-year-old father of four who was totally disabled for 12 weeks.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. He was totally disabled with a fractured foot, knee, and face lacerations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in due time.

Mr. President, there were 12,000 accidents last year involving uninsured motorists. Between 900 and 1,200 of the accident victims were uncompensated for their injuries.

Mr. President, I submit that if the Senator who asked the question had just one member of his family involved, as were those 900 to 1,200 persons last year

who were accident victims of uninsured motorists, he would not ask me what the need is for the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, is the Senator yielding at that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, but if the Senator wishes to ask a question, I would be happy to answer it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will both Senators yield to me, speaking of accidents, so that I may submit a conference report?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized to present a conference report.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3005) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents involving motor vehicles and to reduce deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 31, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 21342-21348.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the work of the conference committee on S. 3005, the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, has produced a bill which is, in my judgment, substantially greater than the sum of its parts. The sessions of the conference committee were conducted in harmony and with a common determination to construct, from the Senate and House versions, the best possible motor vehicle safety program.

In basic structure and purpose, the Senate and the House bills were identical. Each provided for the mandatory establishment of initial standards by January 31 of next year, to be placed into effect on the 1968 model year cars. Each provided for the issuance of new and revised standards a year later, with continuous upgrading of standards thereafter. To insure the establishment of meaningful safety standards, each bill provided for a broad program of research and testing; and to insure compliance, each bill provided broad powers of testing, inspection, and enforcement.

In addition, each bill had elaborate provisions to insure that both car owners and the Secretary of Commerce are

given adequate notice of safety defects discovered after vehicles have left the factory.

This basic structure is, of course, preserved in the conference report. Nevertheless, there remained a number of substantial differences between the Senate and the House versions. The Senate conferees adopted several features of the House bill in the belief that they contributed to the scope and efficacy of the bill.

Thus, the conferees adopted the House treatment of trucks and buses, which clarified the Secretary's authority to set standards for all trucks and buses, but preserved the authority of the ICC to require the addition of nonstructural safety features subsequent to manufacture.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have just two points on which I should like to hear the reaction of the able chairman of the committee. The first has to do with the standards that would be applied in the instances of trucks and buses.

Would not the Secretary, in setting the initial standards for trucks and buses, generally have to follow the existing ICC safety regulations?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Presumably the Secretary would have to rely, at least at the beginning, heavily upon the ICC standards. Of course, he is not limited to them. He may use any existing standards applicable to trucks or buses.

Mr. HART. Does the chairman know of any existing safety standards for trucks and buses except the ICC regulations?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, I do not; and as the Senator knows, the ICC regulations are quite strict. Offhand I do not know of any. GSA regulations might apply to some light trucks that are used by the Government, but they would apply to only that type of vehicle.

Mr. HART. Realizing the shortness of time between now and the end of January of next year, when the initial standards must be issued, and realizing, as the Senator says, that the ICC regulations appear to be, if not the only ones, certainly the most complete existing standards for trucks and buses—

Mr. MAGNUSON. And they are the result of long experience by the ICC in connection with safety regulations.

Mr. HART. Indeed; and, additionally, the fact that manufacturers are now following those regulations in the production of buses and trucks—in view of those facts, is it not to be expected that the Secretary would use the ICC regulations as at least the general basis for his initial set of standards for trucks and buses?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that would be a very reasonable expectation. At least to begin with.

Mr. HART. In any event, the Secretary would be under the obligation to insure that they be, as the bill now reads, "reasonable, practicable, and appropriate for the particular vehicle."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator. My second question has to do with a feature of the bill which I shall not say gave the committee trouble, but which involved problems that we spent considerable time identifying and resolving—the section that deals with the applicability of the antitrust laws.

The Senate committee approved the section of the bill that deals with the application of the antitrust laws to cooperative activities in the field of safety, which was passed by the Senate as section 113 and was passed, in identical language, by the House as section 116, and has now been accepted, of course, by the conferees.

I have the clear impression that when this section was approved by our Committee on Commerce—and was approved unanimously—we did it on the basis of the understanding that our committee report would contain an explanatory statement. A statement is made at page 13 of the committee report; but it had been my understanding that that statement would make clear that manufacturers could rely on the interpretation of the antitrust laws that was given to us, as contained in the Department of Justice letters that are a part of our record. I thought our conclusion was that the report would go on to say that a more detailed amendment incorporating this interpretation was not necessary. The report, however, states only that since the more detailed amendment would be merely declaratory of existing law, the amendment was not necessary.

I assume, and I should like to have the RECORD clearly show—if I am wrong, I can be corrected—there was no intention on the part of the distinguished chairman of the committee to infer that manufacturers could not rely on the interpretations contained in the letters of the Department of Justice.

I noted some time ago that in the discussion in the House the explanation was given that reliance could be had on the interpretation of the Department.

Without further delaying the adoption of the report, I inquire of our able chairman whether this is solely reflective of the purpose and intention.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that I can answer that question for the Senator.

It is the clear understanding of the committee that the manufacturers can rely on the interpretation of antitrust laws contained in the letters of the Department of Justice. As the Senator recalls, the committee went over that matter very carefully. That is the reason why we did not add any more specific language embodying these interpretations in the bill itself.

I think I can speak for the conferees that this was the intention of the conferees and the intention of the Members of the House when they adopted similar language.

Mr. HART. I thank the chairman very much.

I share with the chairman the conviction that this legislation is good. It is a strong bill. It is not an unduly burdensome bill.

I think the public interest is protected. Admittedly, as our experience develops in this area in the years ahead, there may be changes and modifications made in the approach to the problem. However, as of now, our able chairman has brought to the Senate a strong, executive piece of legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The conferees adopted the House provisions relating to the safety, labeling, and grading of tires, which carried out the substance and intention of the tire safety bill, S. 2669, passed by the Senate earlier this year.

The conferees adopted the House provision directing the Secretary to establish standards for used cars, as an aid to State officials in applying meaningful motor vehicle inspection throughout the life of the car on the road.

The Senate conferees accepted, as a most constructive addition, the House provision authorizing the Secretary to require manufacturers to disclose safety performance and technical data on their products to new car purchasers. For that purpose, the Secretary is authorized to require manufacturers to furnish him with such data so that he can determine what should be disclosed to purchasers. In so doing, the Secretary is not expected to divulge manufacturers' trade secrets, except to the extent that he determines such information should be in the hands of prospective purchasers.

The Senate accepted the House provision, similar to the Senate's, requiring the Secretary to develop and test experimental and demonstration motor vehicles and motor vehicle systems and equipment. This program is designed to advance scientific and engineering applications to commercially manufactured motor vehicles and equipment, and should not be limited to traditional methods of automobile design, styling, testing, or production.

The Senate conferees accepted the House provision that compliance with Federal standards does not exempt any person from common law liability. This provision makes explicit, in the bill, a principle developed in the Senate report. This provision does not prevent any person from introducing in a lawsuit evidence of compliance or noncompliance with Federal standards. No court rules of evidence are intended to be altered by this provision.

The Senate Members accepted the House provisions creating a Presidentially appointed Traffic Safety Administrator, operating through a National Traffic Safety Agency, sharing the belief of the House conferees that responsibility for so significant a program as traffic safety should be focused upon a statutory administrator and a statutory agency.

The House bill established a National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council. After considerable discussion, a revised Council provision was adopted by the conferees. The specific representation of motor vehicle manufacturers, motor

vehicle equipment manufacturers, and motor vehicle dealers was left to the determination of the Secretary of Commerce, who will appoint the Council, except that the bill expressly requires that a majority of the Council represent the general public. In addition, the requirement in the House bill that the Secretary must seek the advice and recommendations of the Advisory Council before establishing, amending, or revoking any standard was modified to require that the Secretary generally consult with the Advisory Council on motor vehicle safety standards.

The Senate accepted the House's deletion of the Senate language defining the nature of the Secretary's required consultation with the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission as unnecessary. As the statement of the House managers states:

In the administration of this provision it is expected that the Secretary will, to the extent consistent with the purposes of this Act, inform the VESC and other agencies of proposed standards and amendments thereto and afford them a reasonable opportunity to study and comment thereon.

The Senate conferees accepted the House version of the cooperation provision—authorizing the Secretary to cooperate with interested public and private agencies in the planning and development of standards—because there was no substantive difference between it and the more detailed Senate provision. The term "private agencies" as used in the House language covers, of course, the universities, institutions, and interested businesses such as manufacturers, distributors, and dealers of motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment which were specifically mentioned in the Senate provision.

The Senate bill spelled out in some detail certain of the administrative procedures to be followed in the promulgation of standards; while the House bill made the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act generally applicable. It was the judgment of the conferees that there were no substantial differences between the procedures in the bills with respect to such matters as the requirements for participation of interested persons in the rulemaking process.

The Senate had specified that issued standards be supported by a technical statement and an explanation of its principal purpose that is capable of being understood by the general public. These specific conditions were deleted by the conferees for simplicity, but it was agreed that they were consistent with the general meaning of section 4(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

With respect to sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, which apply to formal hearings, the Senate bill had expressly provided that these sections would not apply to standard-setting procedures under the act. It was the clear understanding of the conferees, however, that under the language of the House bill, the Secretary will utilize the informal rulemaking procedures of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act; and that he need hold a formal hearing under sections 7 and 8 only if he

determines that such hearing is desirable.

There were several features of the Senate bill which the Senate conferees believed should be retained in the final bill. The House Members were uniformly accommodating in accepting these features.

Thus, the House accepted the Senate language modifying the Secretary's authority to extend the effective date for the implementation of any standard by adding the Senate-imposed requirement that such extensions can only be issued for "good cause shown," thus making it clear that industry must sustain the burden of proof before the Secretary, in order to justify an extension of the normal effective date.

The House Members accepted the Senate provision giving the Secretary general investigatory authority in aid of enforcement of standards, the Senate patent provisions, securing the fruits of federally financed research to the general public, the Senate-specified authority to the Secretary to enjoin nonnegligent as well as negligent violations of standards, and the prohibition—taken from the Senate tire bill—against the regrooving of tires.

The House managers also accepted the Senate defect notification procedures to require that the manufacturer furnish the Secretary with the substances of oral as well as written defect communications to their dealers. While the manufacturer will not be required to advise the Secretary of every isolated telephone communication with a dealer concerning a possible defect in a car, the Secretary will be expected to adopt regulations to insure that he is informed of the substance of all communications relating to significant defects.

In addition, the Senate notification procedure makes it clear that the Secretary can make public information concerning safety-related defects or non-compliance with standards where necessary for the public safety. As was stated in the Senate report explaining this procedure, the Secretary will be expected to avoid premature publicity, to check with the manufacturer, and to afford him an opportunity, wherever practicable, to accomplish the required notification and correction through the manufacturers' own procedures.

We were also pleased that the House agreed to the restoration of Senate language for the definition of "motor vehicle safety," recognizing that safety is related to design. Performance standards issued under the act are expected to affect the design of such features, for example, as steering assemblies, instrument panels, seat structures, windshields, seat belts, brakes, and door latch and frame components—all of which will particularly affect the design of these components.

The responsibility for the success of the ambitious program embodied in this legislation shifts to the Traffic Safety Administrator. It will be his task to recruit sufficient competent, trained, and experienced technical personnel and administrators to enable this act to be vigorously and imaginatively implemented. I would hope that the full resources and commitment of civil service

procedures, including provision for an adequate number of supergrade positions, will be applied to the staffing of the National Traffic Safety Agency.

When we began our deliberations on motor vehicle safety, the annual death toll from motor vehicle accidents had reached 49,000. Today, a little over a year later, projected traffic fatalities for 1966 are 53,000; the projection for 1968 is 60,000; and for every fatality there will be 100 injuries. Only with competent and dedicated administration can we expect to mount a meaningful national counterattack to this massive bloodshed.

Mr. President, one final word, about cost.

Press reports and industry sources indicate that the 1967 models will include as standard equipment all but 1 of the 17 minimum safety requirements called for under the GSA specifications on federally purchased vehicles which the Committee on Commerce inaugurated with the General Services Administration 2 or 3 years ago. I believe that we should take public notice of the initiative taken by the industry to hasten the availability of a safer car for the American driver.

However, we are disturbed by other reports of a probable price increase for 1967 models which is being blamed in part on the so-called 1967 safety package.

During the hearings on this bill, there was considerable discussion on the point of what mandatory minimum safety standards might cost the car manufacturer and, more importantly, the individual car buyer. Concern was expressed that the manufacturers would be able to attribute price increases largely to implementation of the safety standards. Some even suggested that the legislation might include a requirement of public disclosure of the actual cost of required safety changes—so the buyer would know what part, if any, of a price increase he was paying to protect himself and his family and what part might be due to other factors.

It would be tragic indeed to permit this significant legislation—which is designed solely to protect the lives and safety of each of the millions of Americans who drive a car—to serve as a license for the automobile makers to increase prices. I want to make it clear that I am not saying that this will happen. It may be said, in fact, that the manufacturers have demonstrated a measure of restraint in their pricing in the past few years.

Nevertheless, I think that this is the appropriate time to give as much information as we can to the American people so they can judge for themselves when the prices for the 1967 models are announced in the next few weeks.

Actual cost data are a carefully guarded secret of the automobile manufacturer. However, a wealth of significant information relative to these costs is available. And from this information some very interesting observations can be made.

First. The 1966 models sold by the Big Four included as standard equipment all but 2—dual brakes and anti-air-pollution control—of the 17 items required by GSA specifications on 1967 models purchased by the Government. This is sup-

ported by the testimony of Mr. John Bugas, a Ford Motor Co. vice president, who testified on behalf of the automobile manufacturers in the hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee this April.

Second. Assuming that the substance of the industry's 1967 "safety package," which will be standard on all cars, will include all of the 17 GSA specifications except the air-pollution-control system, the only addition to items already standard on 1966 models will be dual brakes. Our calculations reveal that the manufacturer's cost for dual brakes should not exceed something between \$8 and \$10. And it should be mentioned that dual brakes were standard equipment on all 1966 American Motors cars and on 1966 Cadillacs.

Third. There is some confusion as to whether 1 of the 17 GSA specifications, the four-way flasher system, was standard on all 1966 models. Even if we add this item, the manufacturer's cost should be less than \$2. And this system was definitely standard equipment on Ford's 1966 models.

The four-way flasher has a button on the dashboard which one presses when in trouble at the side of the road, so that the headlights and taillights will go on and off intermittently, such as common carrier trucks do, to warn oncoming cars of the presence of the vehicle.

Fourth. Where items such as the four-way flasher, which may have been optional previously, are made standard on a new model, it is the practice of the industry to explain a price increase in the new model by pointing to the latest retail list price of the previously optional item. This may well have little relevance to the actual cost increase to the car manufacturer. The unit cost is found to be much less if an item is included on 9 million mass-produced cars than if it is an optional feature which is put on only a percentage of the cars produced. It also disregards the markup between manufacturer and retail on "optionals"—which may run as much as 100 percent or even several times that.

Fifth. A safety consideration which may result in cost reduction is the removal of certain nonessential items which have been recognized as hazards. An example is the chrome strip found on the top rear edge of the front seat.

Sixth. The industry will no doubt tell us that higher labor and material costs require a price increase. If we examine this, we find that there will be increases in wage rates—probably around 3.7 percent including fringe benefits and estimated cost-of-living increases—and materials cost—probably around 2 percent. But we will not hear much about increased productivity of the workers—estimated at about 5 percent—which will keep unit labor costs from rising in spite of wage rate increases, or about the reductions in materials cost which come from improved technology in production and material usage. The net effect of these offsets should cause very little or no overall cost increase to the car manufacturers.

Seventh. It is possible, of course, that significant safety items, in addition to the GSA specifications, will be made standard on all 1967 models. I want to

make clear that we strongly encourage this and that we do not believe it should entail any additional cost to the manufacturer requiring an increase in price. I want to make it absolutely clear that if the industry's 1967 safety package ends up in substance as a reshuffle of the present GSA safety specifications, we are talking about virtually no increase in actual cost to the manufacturer.

(At this point, Mr. McCARTHY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Bugas testified at the hearings that, and I quote:

There are no costs that affect the entire industry that don't get back to the people.

Of course, that is true. But in closing, the following facts should be known about the economic condition of the automobile industry:

First. The 1965 sales of the Big Four were \$38.6 billion and profits \$3.1 billion. First 6 months sales in 1966 are ahead of last year and 1966 profits are expected to be about \$3 billion.

Second. In 1965 the Big Four's return on equity was 21 percent compared to 12.6 percent for all manufacturing. The first 6 months of 1966 indicate a 21.8 percent rate of return for the car companies.

Mr. President, no one is suggesting that car manufacturers do not want to sell a car as reasonably and as cheaply as possible. We hope they will do that. As I say, we have no facts right now that they will not, but I do hope that because of this bill, there will not be a great deal said about the fact that a safer car necessarily must cost more money. In some cases, it might be even cheaper. Restyling and retooling, I understand, cost more; but, in any event, we are hopeful that the 1967 models—I must compliment the manufacturers—will embody many of these factors voluntarily and will have a price range which will reflect the quality of the cars, their performance, and style. If there is an increase in the cost, it should be attributed to that. It might be a better car all around. But the fact that there are safety devices like the GSA's 17 standards, or the 26 which they have suggested for later on, should not, in my opinion, appreciably add to the cost of the car, or dictate any price increase.

The President of the United States, of course, has asked for self-restraint on the part of business and labor in their price and wage policies. I cannot imagine a more critical time than now for the automobile manufacturers to follow along, which I am sure they will do in this particular case.

This matter has been the subject of long hearings. There was some controversy in the conference. We did not change the Senate and House versions considerably. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], was one of the most active members of the conference. We took the best parts of both bills. We took part of the House bill, and we think the final bill is better because of the Senate bill.

I personally would like to have gone further in the field of car safety, but it is a giant step forward and a monumental piece of legislation.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the Commerce Committee for his diligence and his good work in this field. He has demonstrated his capacity as chairman for bringing out the type of legislation which is not alone informative but good for the Nation. I want to also compliment the industry. It seems that some of the benefits as a result of this bill are now being shown, especially when Chrysler introduced its new line yesterday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I read that in the papers. It seems to me that Chrysler took a great step forward.

Mr. HARTKE. Chrysler put heavy emphasis on safety. I think the rest of the industry will do likewise. This legislation is something that will not be harmful to industry, and will be very helpful to the public. I hope it will contribute to reducing the death toll on the highways. With respect to the matter of an advisory council, I think we ought to consolidate the matter as provided in this bill and in the Public Works bill. I do not think we need two advisory councils.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This was one of the sectors of the bill about which we had a great deal of discussion. We had to take some of the House views. The House provided for the council in its bill. We did not have it in our bill. In particular, the Senator from New Hampshire and I insisted that, if there was to be such a council, the public should have the majority representation on that council.

I think we were also practical in that we wanted to have the manufacturers, both of automobiles and equipment, represented on that council. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] did yeoman work in also getting representation for the retail automobile dealers. Also, State and local governments are to be represented. They may consist of a representative of the safety council of a State, or a safety commissioner appointed by a Governor, or it may be a member of a State highway patrol, or an independent expert in automotive safety. None of these laws will work without a conscientious highway patrol.

So we agreed that the council should have on it a majority of public members. The thought also was that there should not be any chance of having any one group dominate. When we say that a majority of the council are to be public members, it may be that the designation "public" may indicate unanimity of opinion, but we know they will have individual ideas of their own. They are going to be independent in their approach, and have their own independent ideas. This is one matter on which we had problems.

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to see the traffic council concept in the bill. I thank the chairman for his efforts in that respect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We had fine cooperation from the chairman of the House committee, Mr. STAGGERS, and with all the members of the House committee.

In this conference, we all had the same objective in mind. I am glad that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is in the Chamber presenting another bill pertaining to the whole situation. I am glad we are doing this before the Labor Day holiday. I do not know what psychological effect it may have on drivers, but at least there should be a consciousness that Congress is interested in safety, as are other public officials, and, yea, the manufacturers. Perhaps we can reduce the terrible carnage on the highways, which would ordinarily happen over a 3-day holiday.

Mr. HARTKE. I should make one more point, with respect to the responsibility which the personnel will have, not only in setting standards but in developing research. I hope the Civil Service Commission will provide the necessary personnel called for in that field, because we know that no matter how hard the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], or any other Senator on the committee works, the truth is that the enactment of a law does not constitute the final conclusion; it is only the first step. So I hope those concerned will move to fulfill the objectives at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope so. It is a big job and a sensitive job, but one which is long overdue and should have the full resources of the Government behind it.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the responsibilities which this act gives to the administrators of the forthcoming traffic safety agency are large and far reaching in their consequences for the safety of the motoring public. These responsibilities—the issuance of motor vehicle safety standards and the research and development programs—must be assumed almost immediately. Crucial to the quality and expeditiousness of the agency's performance is the recruitment of scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel at levels of compensation which will minimize the material sacrifice which these specialists will ordinarily have to make in return for entering upon one of the greatest lifesaving programs this Nation has ever undertaken.

Civil service regulations provide for just such needs by allotting a number of supergrades so that such specialists without previous Government service can be retained at a level up to two grades higher than the usual grade. Indeed, for some new programs, Congress has specifically written into the law a quota of supergrades. One such law was the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act, which provided for 450 supergrades so that our new space program could attract the highly proficient personnel needed to initiate it as quickly as possible. This same need exists with respect to the traffic safety program this Congress has just authorized.

The need exists because for the Government this is essentially a new field of endeavor. There is an acute shortage of trained engineers, scientists, information systems specialists, lawyers, psychologists, economists, physicians, and human factors specialists as well as

other professionals in the field of traffic safety.

It exists because this law requires the new agency to promptly set complicated and technical performance standards for new automobiles. The steady toll of 1,000 dead and nearly 100,000 injured every week permits no delays and no deficiencies in necessary skills, creativity, and determination.

Such demands cannot adequately be met within the time limits set if the agency is not able to attract competent and highly trained personnel.

It is my understanding that there are practically no automotive engineers employed in that capacity in the Government today. Thus, it would not be possible for the new agency to borrow such talent from other agencies on a temporary basis or to entice them away on a permanent basis.

The remaining potential alternatives are for the agency to hire needed people now working in industry or at universities. But this is not likely to occur. The automotive engineers and scientists in industry earn salaries far above those usually paid by Government, and, to compound the problem, they are in short supply. This is a seller's market.

The same generally is true in the universities, because the professors' and researchers' base salaries are usually supplemented by outside consultant fees. A number of the universities recently have received grants for expanded research and testing in the field of traffic safety, or they have expanded their own program. Indeed, one of the purposes of this act is to encourage such expansions. Examples include UCLA, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio State, Cornell, and Northwestern. With expanding programs, the universities resist releasing their experts, and in fact many are trying to attract new talent.

It is true that safety-oriented specialists generally are public service oriented as well. Perhaps some would be willing to help inaugurate this new program even at a loss of income and other fringe benefits. But there is a limit below which trained, experienced specialists cannot be expected to sacrifice in salary in return for worthwhile public service.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that with the passage of this bill there will be intense competition for automotive engineers, scientists, and other traffic safety specialists and even experts from other areas of science and technology whose skills can be readily adapted to motor vehicle safety. I urge most strongly that the Secretary give a high priority to allocate adequate supergrades for this new agency whose work will affect the public safety of millions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]? This is a privileged matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this is the last stop on the road to enactment of the Federal automobile safety act, which is now to be formally known as the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966.

This is a moment of pride for the chairman and members of the Senate Commerce Committee, and for the Senate members of the conference committee—pride in the successful and satisfactory conclusion of a great deal of work. I particularly want to compliment Senator MAGNUSON, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee for his leadership in the development of this bill.

During the long conference, in which some 45 points had to be discussed and disposed of as between the House and the Senate, I can honestly say I have never seen work expedited and a conference handled more skillfully—I was also about to say more adroitly, but I will just say more skillfully—than it was handled by the exceedingly able and distinguished chairman of the committee.

But, Mr. President, this is also a moment for some misgivings—nagging doubts about the breadth and scope of the power which the Government will have over the Nation's largest industry.

If an act of Congress and a program of Government regulations can achieve safer automobiles, I am confident this one will do it. The conference report now before the Senate, which reconciles the differences between the House and Senate versions of this legislation, bestows on the Secretary of Commerce ample authority to assure that cars are safely engineered, safely built, and equipped with safe parts, including tires.

Under the terms of this bill, the Secretary of Commerce, by January 31 of next year, must issue his initial safety standards for new cars, and these standards will be put into effect with the production of the 1968 model cars. A year later, the Secretary must issue new and revised Federal safety standards, and he must thereafter keep his safety standards current with advancing safety technology. Effective and far-reaching means of enforcement will insure that car makers and parts manufacturers will comply with the safety standards.

In addition, the bill requires the manufacturers to notify car buyers if safety defects are found to exist in cars produced and sold. The Secretary of Commerce is also given broad powers to carry out safety research, testing, inspection, and evaluation of safety standards.

The conference committee met in two lengthy sessions to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate versions of this legislation. I think it is fair to say that the conferees agreed on a bill which, taken as a whole, is stronger than either of the original versions.

While there were more than 45 differences to be reconciled by the conferees, many of them were of a technical or noncontroversial nature on which agreement was quickly reached.

From the standpoint of the Senate, the conferees adopted several features of the House bill which were not in the bill as approved by the Senate. These included an advisory council which will be created to consult with the Secretary on safety standards under the act. The conferees also accepted House language requiring the creation of a new National Traffic

Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce which the Secretary must use to carry out the provisions of this act.

The conferees agreed on a House provision requiring the Secretary, after 2 years, to set safety standards on the performance of cars sold as used cars.

The Senate conferees also yielded on a provision, inserted by the House, declaring that compliance with any Federal standard does not exempt any person from liability under common law. Nevertheless, it seems clear and was, I believe, the consensus of the conferees on both sides, that proof of compliance with Federal standards may be offered in any proceeding for such relevance and weight as courts and juries may give it.

Of key importance in the bill is the emphasis which I believe must be placed on the so-called second collision. Unsafe cars are not a major cause of traffic accidents. The regulations and standards issued under this bill will in no way significantly reduce the number of automobile accidents. But, regardless of the causes of the accident, it is clear from abundant research that most injuries and deaths are caused when the driver and passengers are either thrown out of the car or thrown against parts of the car's interior. The extent of the injuries and deaths can, hopefully, be reduced by effective attention to those elements in the passenger compartment which actually cause the deaths and injuries.

At the beginning of my remarks, I mentioned misgivings about the power which the Secretary will exercise over the automobile industry. His administration of this act will require courage, careful deliberation and calm consideration of all factors involved in a tremendous industry.

Whatever may be the opinions expressed, either by the distinguished chairman or by me or any other member of the committee, it is largely impossible for us, sitting here in the Senate and dealing with a highly technical industry, to know what effect, what impact, this act and the safety standards required by the Secretary may have on the cost of automobiles to purchasers.

Every endeavor was made to be fair to a great industry in providing for protection of its trade secrets, as far as compatible with the public safety; and while it is my opinion, and I think the opinion of most of us who went through these hearings and through the entire procedure, that the action and the attention that Congress brought to bear upon this problem have alerted the industry, the public, and all safety organizations, both public and private, I think it would be most unfair to imply that steps taken by the industry very recently were taken because they were bludgeoned into doing so by any threatened act of Congress. Because we have consistently tried to preserve the safety of the public, and at the same time protect the interests of those who are sincerely and ably administering a gigantic industry, affording employment to more Americans than any other.

This is a matter of enormous public interest. The act before the Senate today is not a rash piece of legislation, and

I hope it will not be rashly applied by any Federal official.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there was a provision in the bill which provoked some controversy in the Senate.

The distinguished chairman of the committee did support that provision which would provide that if some means were discovered with Government money to promote automobile safety, it would be made available for the use of everybody. The automobile companies were willing to go along with that provision.

As I understand it, the chairman was successful in persuading the House conferees to retain this provision to protect the public interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We were successful, but it took a lot of time. We had long discussions on the proposal of the Senator who has been so diligent in this field over the years.

The House did agree to the provision and it is now contained in the bill.

I, for one, am glad it is in the bill. I was highly appreciative of the cooperation of the House in this matter. Many Members of the House approved of the provision.

The provision should be in the bill. I can conceive of all kinds of things that could come about as a result of this provision.

I also thank the Senator from Michigan for his patience in this matter both in the hearings before the Committee on Commerce and in the executive sessions.

The Senator from Michigan does come from a State in which the largest industry, I believe, is the manufacture of automobiles.

The Senator was very helpful to all of us.

There were some technical problems in this field that we could not have possibly known about without the advice of the Senator. The Senator did a yeoman job in helping us in this matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I applaud the distinguished chairman of the Senate conferees and also the distinguished Senator from Michigan for the magnificent contributions they have made.

I believe they have brought here a piece of legislation which will save a great many lives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would be somewhat derelict in my feelings and duty if I did not add a word concerning the fine work of the committee staffs of both the House and Senate, those on the minority side as well as the majority side: Mike Pertschuk, the staff counsel; Jerry Kenney, the minority counsel; Jerry Grinstein, the chief counsel; Don Brodie, staff counsel; and Blair Crownover, legislative counsel. Without their help, we would not have understood as much about the technical details as we do now.

Everybody concerned did fine work.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, with this action today we complete a legisla-

tive process that began just 17 months ago when the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations began hearings on the Federal role in traffic safety. There was then set in motion a series of events which have literally made legislative history.

After years of lethargy and shoulder-shrugging about the problem of traffic safety the Nation began to stir itself and a ground swell of demand that something be done about carnage on our roadways made itself felt.

The auto industry responded by making standard equipment safety devices which for years had been optional.

The executive branch responded by taking off the shelf reports long gathering dust and putting together legislative proposals that not long before were considered impossible of passage.

But nowhere was the response more immediate—more effective—and more meaningful than in the Senate Committee on Commerce under the able and inspired leadership of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. His committee tackled the long-ignored problem of traffic safety and put together an exceptional bill designed to launch this Nation for the first time into a meaningful traffic safety effort.

Many individuals contributed to this campaign to make our roads and autos safer. One especially—Mr. Ralph Nader—spent his time, energies and talents in this cause. This proves that a single individual can contribute to the shaping of public policy and events.

It has taken years to enact adequate drug legislation—pesticides control—and other consumer protection measures, most of which require further tightening and improvement. But here in less than a year and a half we stand on the threshold of passing a very strong traffic program.

On the eve of the enactment of this historic legislation, it is not too early to call attention to the need for able administration of the legislation so carefully deliberated in this Congress. The Secretary of Commerce will shortly be given the authority to commence the lifesaving task of advancing the safety of street and highway travel. Unfortunately, there is too much evidence in the recent past to make us complacent about the translation of legislative authority into substantive achievement.

The Traffic Safety Act of 1966 is mission oriented. The volumes of hearings and the repeated expressions of congressional intent point to the end of toleration of such massive bloodshed. There is a job to be done that has been too long neglected, too long smothered with slogans and indifference. To get this mission of safety underway, the Secretary of Commerce must give high priority to the recruitment of the ablest technical and administrative specialists that this country can produce. This will not be an easy quest. Motor vehicle safety has not been an active field for scientists, engineers, physicians, and other experts. This is not surprising. For this country spent less than \$6 million in traffic safety research last year—

about the price of a medium jet bomber. Over the long term, efforts must be made to make traffic safety as exciting and attractive a field for graduates of our colleges and universities as space and oceanography are today. But for the short term—the period during which the program receives its shape and energy—it will be necessary to provide supergrades and flexible job classifications to recruit the skills that will apply our scientific and engineering genius toward the prevention of death and injury on our highways. Nothing less than the best minds and courageous spirits is required. There must be an end to the petty squabbling, administrative infighting and lethargy, that frequently characterized the limited Federal effort in highway safety in the past.

Further, Mr. President, this great act should not be a signal to the automotive industry to leave more and more of the research and development burden on public agencies and public funds. I am hopeful that the industry will augment its commitment to safety design and make available its great resources and talents for the production of safer cars with every passing year. It is our hope that the automobile companies will begin to compete vigorously over safety as they have done over style and performance. Competition over safety remains a stimulus to safer cars that cannot be overestimated. The consumer information and defect disclosure provisions of this act should provide incentives for the auto companies to continually improve their design safety and quality control. In addition, the provision in the act to require the Secretary to develop experimental safety cars and motor vehicle equipment and cooperate with appropriate State programs will help the Secretary issue meaningful safety standards and act as a spur to the auto industry. I commend the New York State safety car project which inspired the inclusion of this important provision in the act.

The Commerce Committee report acknowledged the auto industry's recommendation that the Secretary be advised to consider, among other factors, the factor of cost in setting safety standards. I would like to urge the automobile companies to utilize the fruits of their mass production techniques and increases in productivity to keep the cost of safety down. The Senate hearings contained examples of many safety improvements which would cost no more or merely a few cents more than would be the case without them. Reducing glare and flattening out instrument panel shapes were two illustrations of no added cost, just added care. The lower costs are kept, the more safety can be incorporated in automobiles. And the more lives can be spared.

I am proud of this legislation and proud of the Congress which moved so quickly and wisely to enact it. The act represents the initiative and vitality of the congressional role in lawmaking at its best.

Mr. President, we began with the question, What is the Federal role in traffic safety? The question has now been answered in the form of this bill about

to become law. The Federal role—which did not exist 17 months ago—today has form and substance and a statutory base. The question that remains is whether this program will be properly and effectively administered in an administrative framework which measures up to the massive job ahead. With that in mind I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at the end of my remarks a letter I have received from Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY, of Georgia, who has from the beginning worked in behalf of traffic safety legislation in the other body. Congressman MACKAY's proposal to establish a single National Traffic Safety Agency in the executive branch deserves careful consideration and attention.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966.

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Old Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: There are compelling arguments in favor of the establishment of a single National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a Traffic Safety Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

We have a Bureau of Public Roads charged with the construction of our federal aid highway system and it has an Administrator appointed by the President. It has worked well.

We have a Federal Aviation Agency charged with the safety of air travelers with an Administrator appointed by the President. It has worked well.

We have failed to fix responsibility and provide leadership for a national traffic safety program and we have paid a price. For the first time in the history of the automobile more than fifty thousand American citizens were killed in a twelve consecutive month period (July 1, 1965 to July 1, 1966). The costs are well known to all of us.

Students of the federal role all agree that we have lacked a focus of leadership at the national level. The Secretary of Commerce in his March 3rd, 1959, letter to the House Committee on Public Works said, "Most notable among the deficiencies is the near total lack of working liaison among agencies engaged on closely related endeavors" (p. 120). And, further he diagnosed lack of coordinated effort between federal, state and local governments by saying "Lack of an official working focus in the Federal Government may well have been a contributing factor" (p. 149).

And President Johnson said in his Transportation message on March 2nd of this year that the reason we are failing in traffic safety is, "Existing safety programs are widely dispersed. . . . There is no clear assignment of responsibility at the Federal level."

In the same address the President stated that under existing law to strengthen the Federal role he had set in motion a number of steps: "I am assigning responsibility for coordinating Federal Highway Safety programs to the Secretary of Commerce. I am directing the Secretary to establish a major highway safety unit within his Department. This unit will ultimately be transferred to the Department of Transportation."

Today some four and one-half months and some 16,000 deaths later this has not been done.

As further evidence of the lack of coordination in the executive branch the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare announced last week that he had appointed a "top-level advisory committee to chart out an

aggressive new look for the Department in Traffic Safety."

It has become increasingly apparent that the gravity of the extent of losses from traffic accidents requires explicit Congressional assignment of responsibility.

This can be done by choosing one of two alternatives.

First, if a Department of Transportation is established then Congress can direct that under the Highway Section in addition to a Bureau of Public Roads, there shall be a National Traffic Safety Agency and Administrator and Congress can charge the Secretary of Transportation with administering all traffic safety laws through the agency. To do less would make it appear that we value human safety on our roads less than the building of the roads.

Second, if the Department of Transportation fails, then the establishment of the Agency and the appointment of the Administrator may be of even greater importance in view of past performance of the Department of Commerce.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Agency-Administrator arrangement will be approved and adopted by this Congress and I respectfully solicit your leadership in attaining this goal.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. MACKAY,
Member of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF MINING—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4665) relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Sept. 1, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 21664-21665.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, under present law, mining exploration expenditures are deductible in computing taxable income but only to the extent they do not exceed two limitations. First, the deduction for these expenditures during any taxable year may not exceed \$100,000. Second, the total amount of the deductions taken by any one taxpayer for these expenditures for

all taxable years may not exceed \$400,000. Expenditures in excess of these limitations must be capitalized—that is, they must be added to the cost of the property.

The bill, as it passed the House, removed both the \$100,000 per year and the \$400,000 overall ceilings on deductions which may be taken for exploration expenditures where the exploration occurs within the United States. However, under the House bill, exploration expenditures deducted after the date of enactment of this bill were to be "recaptured" either by decreasing the depletion deductions if the mine reaches the production stage or by treating an appropriate amount of any gain as ordinary income in the case of most dispositions of the property. The House bill repealed entirely the deduction for exploration expenditures in the case of exploration abroad.

The bill, as it passed the Senate, made two major modifications in the House bill:

First, the Senate version provided that all taxpayers are to be given the right to continue to deduct exploration expenditures—subject to the \$100,000 and \$400,000 ceilings of existing law—without any "recapture" rules being applied. This change also has the effect of restoring the deduction of exploration expenditures for foreign and oceanographic explorations up to the limits of \$100,000 a year or \$400,000 overall as provided under present law.

Second, a floor amendment was made with respect to exploration expenditures in the case of coal. Under the House bill, exploration expenditures in the case of coal were continued as under present law. That is, they were continued as deductible items but only to the extent of the \$100,000 limit per year or \$400,000 limitation overall. Coal exploration expenditures were not included in the new provision added by the House removing the ceilings but providing for the recapture of exploration expenditures. This was appropriate under the House version of the bill since most coal exploration expenditures are incurred by taxpayers who are unlikely ever to reach the \$400,000 ceiling. However, the Senate version of the bill provided taxpayers with an option to take either the present law treatment for exploration expenditures or the House bill treatment without limitation but with the recapture provisions. While most taxpayers incurring coal exploration expenditures probably prefer to remain under the existing law provision, nevertheless, there are those whose operations are large enough so that the ceilings on deductible expenditures present a problem. Therefore, the Senate version of the bill permitted those exploring for coal deposits the same option as those exploring for other minerals—the option to take either present law treatment or the House bill provision.

I am glad to be able to report to the Senate that your conferees returned to you having succeeded in retaining a very large proportion of the Senate amendments.

First, we have retained the feature of the Senate bill which made it possible for taxpayers to elect either present law treatment—with the \$100,000 and \$400,-

000 ceilings on deductible exploration expenditures but without recapture—or the House bill treatment—which removes the limitations but provides for recapture.

The only basic modification in this is that your conferees agreed that the taxpayer must make his choice as to which of these provisions he would prefer to have apply in his case within 3 years after the time prescribed by law for the filing of the return for the first year after the date of enactment of this provision in which exploration expenditures are paid or incurred. This 3-year period is to be determined without taking into account any extensions of time for the filing of the return. Rules have also been provided in the conference agreement where two taxpayers merge—or in some other way the property of one is transferred to the other with the basis of the property remaining the same in the hands of the transferee as in the hands of the transferor. In these cases, if the transferor had elected the House bill type of treatment, the recapture provisions will apply with respect to this property in the hands of the transferee. However, on the other hand, should the transferor have elected present law treatment and the transferee have elected the House bill type of treatment, the recapture rules will apply in this case also with respect to the property transferred. Where property is transferred and no election has been made at that time, or not finally made, the exploration expenditures must be capitalized instead of being deducted under either of the two options I have referred to.

The second major change made by the Senate—which gives an option with respect to coal exploration to be treated under either the House or the present law provisions—has been retained by the conference agreement.

I believe that the Senate conferees have retained the essence of the option provided in the Senate version of this bill to be treated with respect to exploration expenditures either in the manner provided under present law or in the manner provided by the House bill. This will be important in that it does not eliminate the deduction of foreign or oceanographic exploration expenditures up to the \$100,000 and \$400,000 limitations. It is also important because it retains for the small domestic explorer the option to continue under present law without the application of the recapture provisions in those cases where he does not expect to have aggregate exploration expenditures much in excess of \$400,000. Taxpayers of this type would have been injured by the House bill, but will not be injured by the conference agreement. In addition, it was important to preserve the Senate version of the bill to give those who explore in the case of coal deposits the opportunity to be treated either under the present law provision or under the House bill provision.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate conferees have been successful in retaining the main features of the Senate amendments, and I urge the adoption of this report.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in the bill as passed, I believe there was a provision that would retain the tax treatment for expenditures made in mining overseas. Is that provision still in the measure?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is. The manner it was agreed to in the conference is that the company could have its choice. They could either continue to do this under existing law, which limits them to \$400,000, not subject to recapture, or, if they wanted to claim greater expenses than that, they could elect to take the alternative as passed by the House, which most major companies will do because they did object to the \$400,000 limitation. However, in that event, the exploration expenses are subject to recapture over the years.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the chairman. This is a matter of great concern to many relatively small companies in my State. These companies are engaged in operations in Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean, or in some other region, and those companies were concerned that that provision might be taken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NOMINATIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was very happy to hear the announcement by President Johnson today that he has nominated Mr. Charles F. Luce to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I applaud the President's choice of Mr. Luce, and, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am confident that he will be an able administrator in his new position. As Under Secretary of Interior, Mr. Luce will be joining a team headed by Secretary Stewart L. Udall, whose leadership in the field of natural resources, in my judgment, has been outstanding and unsurpassed on the national scene.

At the same time, the President is appointing the present Under Secretary of the Interior, John A. Carver, Jr., to membership on the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Carver's very able services have been accorded recognition on a number of occasions in this body and elsewhere, and I take this occasion to pay further tribute.

Many of us first knew John Carver when he was administrative assistant to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. He was appointed by President Kennedy as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Lands in 1961 and then as Under Secretary of the Department on December 30, 1964. In his numerous appearances before the Interior Committee as spokesman for the Interior Department, he impressed all of the members with his pro-

found knowledge of natural resources, his incisive analysis of problems, and the forthrightness and candor of his presentation.

I know I speak for all members of the Interior Committee when I wish John Carver every success in his new post as Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Mr. Carver be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN A. CARVER, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. Carver became Under Secretary on December 30, 1964, thus exercising the second highest responsibility for the administration of the Interior Department.

Prior to this appointment, he served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior since January 30, 1961. In that capacity he supervised the activities of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Office of Territories, and the Alaska Railroad.

He was administrative assistant to Senator Frank Church of Idaho from January 1957 until appointed Assistant Secretary. In 1947-48 he served as assistant attorney general of Idaho, and from 1948-57 he was in private law practice in Boise. He also has had considerable experience as a career Federal Civil Service personnel executive from 1940-47, with the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel and the Civilian Personnel Division, Office of the Secretary of War where he directed field activities successively in Ogden, Utah, Baltimore, Md., and New York City.

Mr. Carver was born in Preston, Idaho, April 24, 1918. He has an A.B. degree from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah (1939) and an LL.B. degree from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. (1947).

Inducted into the military in May 1943, he was later commissioned in the U.S. Air Force, and served as a civilian personnel officer of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey in England and Japan.

Mr. Carver is a member of the bar in Idaho and the District of Columbia; is a member of the American Bar and Federal Bar Associations. He is a member of the National Advisory Committee, Center for Advanced Study in Organization Science, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Mr. Carver married Ruth O'Connor of Seattle, Wash. in June 1942. They have three children: John A. III, 19, student at the University of Wisconsin; Craig Roger, 16; and Candace Elaine, 13. The family lives at 6605 16th Street North, Arlington, Va.

Mr. JACKSON. At the same time, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced the appointment of David S. Black, of Seattle, Wash., to be Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I have known Mr. Black all of his life. He was born in my hometown of Everett, Wash. He is a member of a very prominent family in the State of Washington.

Upon graduation from law school, he entered the private practice of law, where he remained until 1957, when he became an assistant attorney general for the State of Washington and counsel for the Washington Public Service Commission.

He represented the public service commission and the public in proceedings before the agency and as intervenor in cases before the Federal regulatory agencies.

Mr. Black left his position with the State in April 1961 to accept an appointment as General Counsel for the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in Washington, D.C.

He served in this capacity until his appointment to the Federal Power Commission in 1964. Mr. Black presently is a member of the Federal Power Commission, serving as Vice Chairman during 1965 and until March of this year.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a biographical sketch of Mr. Black be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSIONER DAVID S. BLACK, DEMOCRAT, OF WASHINGTON

(Took office—August 30, 1963; Term expires—June 22, 1968)

David S. Black was born in Everett, Washington, on July 14, 1928. He attended Stanford University where he received his B.A. degree in 1950. After two years of service in the Army during the Korean conflict, Mr. Black attended the University of Washington and received his LL.B. degree in 1954.

He then entered private law practice as an associate with Preston, Thorgrimson and Horowitz, a Seattle, Washington, law firm. Mr. Black remained with that firm until 1957 when he became Assistant Attorney General for the State of Washington and Counsel to the Washington Public Service Commission. He represented the Public Service Commission and the public in proceedings before that Agency and as intervenor in cases before Federal Regulatory Agencies.

Mr. Black left his position with the state in April of 1961 to accept appointment as General Counsel for the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in Washington, D.C. He served in this capacity until his appointment to the Federal Power Commission.

President Kennedy nominated Mr. Black to the Federal Power Commission on July 22, 1963, for the term expiring June 22, 1968. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on August 26, 1963. He took office on August 30, 1963. On August 7, 1964, he was elected to serve as Vice Chairman for the remainder of 1964 to fill the position left vacant by the death of Commissioner Harold C. Woodward. He was re-elected Vice Chairman for the calendar year 1965 and agreed to continue as Vice Chairman in 1966 pending appointment and Senate confirmation of a new Federal Power Commissioner. He stepped down as Vice Chairman on March 3, 1966, after Lee C. White took office as Chairman. Commissioner Black was Chairman of the Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources and a member of the Executive Committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

A Democrat, Mr. Black is married to the former Nancy Haskell of Seattle. They have three children—two sons and a daughter.

Mr. JACKSON. With respect to Mr. Luce, I am proud to have known him both personally and officially for many years. Since February of 1961 he has served with distinction as Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration. I know that he will bring the same determination, skill, and courage to his new

position in the Department of the Interior. At this critical point in history, it has become increasingly obvious that our Nation must marshal all of our natural resources to meet the needs of a growing population and a complex modern society. I am confident that Charles F. Luce will play a major role in meeting this national need.

There is no question about the ability and qualification of Mr. Luce to carry out the new assignment entrusted to him by the President. He has demonstrated creative imagination, courage in pursuing difficult goals, and highest competence in directing a revitalized resource development and conservation program. His achievements, including the Columbia River Treaty with Canada, advancement of direct-current transmission, Hanford nuclear powerplant, and west coast interties, have demonstrated a new high in cooperation among public and private agencies and Government and have produced significant benefits for the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a biographical sketch of Mr. Luce.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA: CHARLES F. LUCE, ADMINISTRATOR, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PERSONAL

Born August 29, 1917, in Platteville, Wisconsin.

Wife, Helen Oden Luce.

Children, James O.; Christine Mary; Barbara Anne; Charles F., Jr.

Residence, 7012 E. Sleret Avenue, Vancouver, Washington 98664.

EDUCATION

Platteville High School, 1935.

Platteville Teachers' College, 1935-1937.

University of Wisconsin, 1937-1941, B.A. and LL.B. degrees, both with honors.

Elected to Phi Beta Kappa and Order of the Coif.

Member of Phi Delta Phi, Harlan Inn, Wisconsin.

Graduate studies, Yale Law School, Sterling Fellowship, 1941-1942.

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

Attorney, Board of Economic Warfare, Washington, D.C., 1942-1943.

Law Clerk for Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black, United States Supreme Court, 1943-1944.

Attorney, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, Portland, Oregon, 1944-1946.

Engaged in general practice of law, Walla Walla, Washington, 1946-1961.

PRESENT POSITION

Appointed Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, Portland, Oregon, by the Secretary of the Interior, February 15, 1961, under Schedule C, C.S.C. Reg. 6.310(1) (1). Position established under Sec. 2(a), Bonneville Project Act, 16 U.S.C. 832a(a) (1958).

MEMBERSHIPS AND AFFILIATIONS

American Bar Association.

American Judicature Society.

Oregon State Bar Association.

Washington State Bar Association.

Wisconsin State Bar Association.

Blue Mountain Masonic Lodge No. 13, Walla Walla, Washington.

32nd Degree Scottish Rite, Walla Walla, Washington.

Shrine, El Katif, Spokane, Washington.

St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Walla Walla, Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Hearings will be held on Mr. Luce's nomination by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Thursday, September 8, beginning at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. The public is invited to attend, and the committee will be glad to hear any Member of Congress or any other persons who are interested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington, in what he has said about these three men. Like the junior Senator from Washington, I have known them for many years—Charlie Luce, in particular, and Mr. Black.

Both the junior Senator from Washington and I have known the Black family for a long time—ever since I can remember. They have served the Government with tremendous energy and dedication and a great deal of ability.

Mr. Luce will be the Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Black will have the very important job of Administrator of Bonneville, and Mr. Carver will be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

I think we are fortunate to have men of this caliber in these positions, and I hope the Senate will confirm them quickly.

Mr. Carver will come before the Committee on Commerce on Thursday, the 10th. We will have a hearing with respect to him at that time, but we will see whether we can expedite the hearings on both men and have the matter before the Senate so that they may be confirmed.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recently the Senate Finance Committee conducted 2 days of hearings on bills to provide Government assistance through either tax incentives or direct grants to political parties and candidates for the expenses of political campaigns.

One of the bills before the committee is S. 3496, which I introduced, to provide a contribution by the Federal Government to political parties based on the votes cast for the candidates of those parties in presidential elections.

Although direct Federal financing of political campaigns has been suggested in the past, it has never received widespread publicity or support, nor has the idea been implemented through a specific proposal. But now, S. 3496 sets forth a workable and logical method of relieving candidates and parties of the awesome burden of collecting huge sums of money for presidential campaigns.

There appears to be a new wave of support for government funding of political campaigns. Within the past 2 weeks,

two substantial articles on the subject by knowledgeable persons, who happen to be of vastly different political philosophies, have come to my attention.

On the front page of the Boston Globe of August 18, an article by Harvard economist, former confidant of President Kennedy and U.S. Ambassador to India, John Kenneth Galbraith, set forth his thesis that since campaign expenditures were a responsibility of all the people, the government—in this case of Massachusetts—should provide funds for candidates running for political office in that State.

On Monday, August 22, syndicated newspaperman David Lawrence devoted his widely read column to proposing that Congress appropriate \$60 million a year to an election fund to cover the expenses of all campaigns.

While I may not agree in all particulars with the proposals of Mr. Galbraith or Mr. Lawrence, I am pleased that they concur with me that Government must pay the cost of political campaigns. I am also happy that a number of witnesses at the Finance Committee hearings, including Senator MORTON of Kentucky, Under Secretary of Treasury Barr, the AFL-CIO, and others, saw merit in the sort of proposal embodied in S. 3496. I would hope that others would engage in a critical analysis of this subject so that before long Congress can act on this very important matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Galbraith and Mr. Lawrence appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 18, 1966]

GALBRAITH SPEAKS OUT ON CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS—A BOLD REMEDY FOR A MASSACHUSETTS PLAGUE

(The Contention: "The disclosure provisions are a farce. They allow the candidate to reveal what is reasonably honest and conceal what isn't. The present law was written not to ensure honesty, but to suggest some superficial concern for it.")

(The result: "In all instances without exception, the people of Massachusetts pay the bill in unnecessarily expensive services, incompetent or larcenous job holders, scammed or overpaid construction or favoritism in law enforcement or none at all.")

(The Proposal: "Provide every regularly nominated candidate with a public grant of sufficient size to enable him to get his name, merit, if any, and platform before the people.")

(The Boston Globe recently asked Harvard Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith for his comments on campaign financing and means of preventing abuses in campaign contributions.)

(In response, the longtime adviser to President Kennedy and Adlai Stevenson submitted the following:)

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

During the next two-and-a-half months, the atmosphere of Massachusetts, already taxed in some areas, will be carrying a heavy added load of charges and countercharges on campaign financing. This will be an instance not of the pot calling the kettle black but rather of a whole shelfful of sooty vessels condemning each other for their grime. Every significant candidate for public office now raises money and the number of potential statesmen in this commonwealth who can count on campaign funds purely in consequence of the love they inspire or the

admiration of moral virtue that they elicit is negligible.

Contractors, loan sharks, insurance brokers, job seekers and a variety of multiple-purpose grifters contribute money in the manner of architects in the expectation that if their man is elected he will assist them in practicing their particular art on behalf of, and at the expense of, the people of Massachusetts.

From this outlay they expect to retrieve enough future income to pay off the investment with a reasonable profit. Since campaign funds continue to be available from some of the most acquisitive and uncharitable money makers anywhere awaiting eternal punishment, it must be assumed as a matter of simple economics that the investment pays off. Among campaign contributions, I, of course, include the tickets to testimonial dinners, contributions that are disguised as loans, property and facilities made available for use and commercial services donated to a candidate.

In all instances without exception, the people of Massachusetts pay the bill in unnecessarily expensive services, incompetent or larcenous jobholders, scamped or overpriced construction or favoritism in law enforcement or none at all. This, in singular degree, is a situation of which one can truly say there is no free lunch.

President Johnson has recently proposed a drastic tightening of Federal campaign financing. Massachusetts may well lead the nation in the abuse of present arrangements, and it unquestionably does in self-righteous and windy accusations by one malefactor of the others. So it should lead the way in reform. That is the purpose of this proposal.

It may be noted that the present legislation on campaign contributions and expenditures is patently inadequate. It does not prevent the raising of large amounts of money from persons with corrupt intent. Nor, what is more important, does it touch the need to do so if the candidate is to have a serious chance.

The disclosure provisions are a farce. They allow the candidate to reveal what is reasonably honest and conceal what isn't. The present law was written not to ensure honesty but to suggest some superficial concern for it. Here is what I propose:

PUBLIC GRANTS FOR CANDIDATES

1. Provide every regularly nominated candidate with a public grant of sufficient size to enable him to get his name, merit, if any, and platform before the people. These grants would be available to candidates for state-wide office, the General Court and for the Senate and House of Representatives. They would be graded in size in accordance with the importance and regional scope of the office and should be substantial—perhaps \$500,000 for a candidate for the governorship or Senate down to \$1,000 for a member of the Legislature.

2. Similar though smaller provision would be made for primary candidates for state-wide office subject to provisions for limiting the number of candidates. There should be either stiffened requirements on signatures or a provision that the candidate, to qualify for a grant, should receive a minimum proportion of the delegate votes cast at the convention of his party.

3. Except as later specified, no candidate for nomination or election to public office in the commonwealth might accept any contribution of money, property, advertising, services other than unpaid volunteer services or anything else of commercial value whatever for or on behalf of his campaign.

4. The prohibition against such contributions should operate against both the individual, organization or corporation offering such contribution and the person receiving it. The penalties for violation should be

severe. Conviction should involve disqualification from public office for the term for which the candidate was elected.

TWENTY FIVE-DOLLAR GIFT LIMIT

5. Contributions would be permitted to an absolute maximum of \$25 for any person for any primary or general election. All such contributions would be paid not to the candidate but to the state auditor, who would in turn redistribute them to the designated candidates. The auditor would keep a record of all such contributions. No money-raising dinner or like occasion would be permitted where the cost of the tickets exceeded by more than \$25 the cost of the meal. All proceeds from such occasions also would be deposited with the state auditor for redistribution to the candidates.

It will be observed that this arrangement would allow public participation in campaign financing and allow a candidate with a genuinely wide following to benefit therefrom. While it is recognized that a certain number of Massachusetts politicians have a price of less than \$25, this seems a reasonable maximum for purposes of excluding any possibility of financial obligation to a contributor.

6. A limit, in no case exceeding a few hundred dollars and for most offices much less, should be established for each political office on what the candidate might spend from his personal funds. All candidates would be required to keep such current records as would allow for a rapid and full audit of their expenditures. Such an audit might be instituted in instances of alleged or suspected violation or as a general enforcement measure during the course of a campaign. There would be similar provision for other prompt investigation of other alleged irregularity.

7. An Electoral Practices Enforcement Board, consisting of three distinguished citizens, should be constituted with all necessary staff of auditors and inspectors to supervise and enforce the application of this law and to make appropriate recommendations to close loopholes.

CANDIDATES MUST AGREE

8. The foregoing is called the Electoral Reform Plan—E.R.P. of 1966. Acceptance of E.R.P. by a candidate would mean its acceptance as a minimum program.

SMALL LEVY

9. As a possible optional point, the cost of this legislation and its enforcement would be paid by a small percentage levy which contractors and all others doing business with the commonwealth would add to their billing and pay into the expenses and enforcement fund. This would dramatize the fact that this small levy replaces the much larger one now concealed in prices paid by the commonwealth.

The intent of this plan is not to provide a fig leaf for abuse but to eliminate abuse. Candidates who accept it are expected to accept it without equivocation, reservation or normal Massachusetts intention to evade. Those who come up with elaborate reasons for opposing such reform, especially if they continue to accuse their opponents of malpractice, can safely be regarded by the electorate as political frauds.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
Aug. 22, 1966]

TIME TO BAN POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS?

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe the time has come to prohibit all financial contributions to the campaigns of candidates for public office or to political organizations, and to forbid any substantial sums to be expended by a candidate out of his own pocket. This is not a new idea but one which, because of recent events, is again being discussed.

During the present session of Congress, innuendoes frequently have been uttered with respect to the propriety of the so-called President's Club to which individuals—including heads of companies—contribute \$1,000 or more for the privilege of attending special political functions at which the President is scheduled to be present.

In fact, it was charged in Congress a few days ago that a contractor and his family had donated \$25,000 to the President's Club and that the contributor's firm would become the beneficiary of a piece of pending legislation involving a public project. The House voted it down.

Such an incident arouses suspicion although, as one House member said, it still may be only a "coincidence." The embarrassment, however, arises just the same and may be unfair not only to the contributor but to the candidate who, when elected, must deal with matters that could affect any constituent.

If the Congress would appropriate \$60 million a year to be put in an election fund, this would cover the expense of all campaigns, including primaries, for federal, state and local office. This is a small sum to spend out of the more than \$100 billion appropriated each year by the federal government for a variety of items, hardly any of them as important as the preservation of the integrity of the whole election process.

It would also remove the discrimination which arises in favor of the rich man in politics. He today can use not only his own funds but hundreds of thousands of dollars which sometimes are provided by relatives.

Organized labor, incidentally, seems to feel that the government should pay at least a part of political campaign expenses by allowing a tax deduction or credit for such contributions. This was recommended by an AFL-CIO spokesman in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee last week. Union members usually contribute several million dollars to political campaigns.

Congress has set a maximum figure of \$5,000 for representatives and \$25,000 for senators as the amounts which they themselves can receive or spend in a campaign for election. There are proposals to increase these figures and also the limit of \$5,000 a year which individuals may contribute to a candidate or political committee.

The argument is that, with the advent of television and the high cost of campaigning, more realistic sums should be authorized as a maximum for individual contributions.

But this doesn't reach the real problem, as the biggest sums of money spent in campaigns are collected and spent by organizations which are not identified with either of the two major political parties.

Thus, while corporations and labor unions are prohibited by the federal corrupt practices act from making contributions in connection with any election, this is really no barrier, because separate organizations are formed for political purposes only. Time is contributed by persons whose salaries are paid by labor organizations or corporations, so the net result in many campaigns is a donation of time and money which the beneficiaries recognize fully as coming from certain interested groups.

It wouldn't cost the taxpayers much to bear the expense of political campaigning, and the money could be appropriated for each state on a voter registration basis and allocated to regularly established political organizations outside as well as inside the major parties.

A public accounting of every dollar spent would, of course, be required. Federal disbursing officers would be appointed to allocate the funds just as federal registrars today are designated in certain states to supervise

the registration process for voting. Individual contributions or the spending of private funds to elect any candidate would be banned by law. Maybe some day this will be adopted as the only sure way to prevent elections from being bought by vested interests.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9918) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator would yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this makes it very difficult, because then I cannot ask any questions of the Senator, because he does not have to answer them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think the Senator will yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. He has yielded the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say this: I will be happy to engage in a colloquy as soon as the distinguished Senator has offered his first amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask for a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLLUTION OF WATER AND AIR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, public attention at long last has been focused on the pollution of our Nation's water and air. The people of this country no longer will tolerate the shocking contamination of our environment. They want, and will demand the air we breathe and the water we drink to be clean, free of all pollutants. This desire of the people was recently recognized by the Senate when it overwhelmingly passed S. 2947 and S. 3112, forward-looking amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act and Clean Air Act.

I have just read two highly provocative articles on pollution abatement. I believe they will be of interest to all who are waging the war for clean air and water.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of these two articles, "Industrial Waste Isolation" by Halcolm S. Crawford and Clark A. Ritchie in the May-June 1966 edition of the *Military Engineer* and "More Yellow Pages, More Blue Sky" by W. L. Guthrie in the May 1965 edition of the *Izaak Walton* magazine.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL WASTE ISOLATION—A NEW CONCEPT TO PRESERVE FRESH WATER

(By Halcolm S. Crawford and Clark A. Ritchie)

The reduction of water pollution to an acceptable limit, as established by a graduated scale of criteria, is required of all local governments under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965. The problem is enormous. Its importance is paramount to everyone, for it is ultimately a matter of survival. Lake Erie, for example, one of the five largest bodies of fresh water in the world, is now polluted to the point where fish and aquatic life are extinct, and it is doubtful if its water is fit for human use. The lower reaches of all major American rivers are similarly polluted. An immediate gargantuan effort is now required to attempt to compensate for long lost time in coping with this condition.

POLLUTION

Pollution is a toxic, obnoxious, disease-laden, or unusable water caused by sewage or industrial waste. These two causes are different.

Sewage is the natural waste from man, animals, and plants, and occurs by random distribution. Nature takes care of this sewage but when it is concentrated by man, a glut results which will pollute any watercourse. So man must treat his sewage or be faced with water pollution below any point where it is not treated. Any concentration of sewage on boats and ships also must be considered as a contaminant of some importance. Vessels should have facilities to collect and dispose of sewage into sewers leading to sewage disposal plants ashore. Treatment of water not containing industrial waste may be a fairly simple biochemical process. Typical sewage disposal plants help the natural bacteria digest the sewage by providing more oxygen through aeration (aerobic process), more material surface by reducing the particle size of the sewage, and temperature control, sedimentation, and agitation. There are several processes, some of which are proprietary. Sludge and liquid are often treated separately. Filtering, sedimentation, and oxygenation are common to most methods. The sewage is reduced mostly to nitrates and sulphates which are removed and dried for commercial fertilizer. If the process is complete, the liquid effluent is very nearly pure water. But such complete treatment is not possible where any general industrial waste is introduced with the sewerage. This is because industrial wastes kill the bacteria on which sewage disposal depends, or it uses the oxygen supply, or both.

Chemical treatment of sewage is available by a number of processes, but it is not generally as effective as biological treatment. No current sewage treatment process is profitable although recovery of valuable fertilizer does reduce the cost.

Industrial waste is any water-soluble or waterborne material produced by man which is not native to the earth's surface. This includes organic materials such as oil products; wastes from coal, wood products, and the food industry; and nearly the entire range of inorganic chemicals such as acids, alkalies, metallic salts, cyanamides, and phenols. Some of these products are deadly poison to man even in very small quantities. They are usually poisonous to the bacteria on which sewage disposal depends, and commonly have an affinity for oxygen. If the biochemical oxygen demand is excessive from either sewage or industrial waste treatment, the water will be depleted of dissolved

oxygen and anaerobic decomposition is apt to occur, resulting in putrefaction, foul odors, and toxins.¹

Sewage and industrial wastes are seldom completely treated separately, but are usually dumped in the same sewerage system. This is an important reason why increasing contamination must now be expected as waters are reused and approach the sea. The greater the quantity of sewage and industrial waste, and the greater the number of times the water passes through the use-pollution-treatment cycle, the less pure it can be made.

Since sewage disposal and industrial waste cannot be treated effectively together, or in sequence, they should be separated and handled in different systems.

The total effect of all pollutants on watercourses and ground water must be thoroughly considered. Surface flow is faster than underground flow so the effect is seen more quickly. On the other hand, when well water becomes contaminated, it may take years of corrective action to overcome the seeping pollution.

Current treatment. Mechanical means may be used to separate waste solids or semi-solids from liquid, as well as liquids or materials of different densities, and may be used alone or with chemicals. There are general chemical treatments for such substances as acids and alkalies, and specific treatments for poisons and other substances. Treatment is expensive, although recovery of valuable chemicals cuts the cost and may in some future cases become profitable.

To keep the effluent under the maximum specified contamination limits, it is common practice to use good water to dilute the concentration of wastes. This is an abominable practice—the equivalent of throwing good money after bad. The effluent is made less objectionable by treatment, but cannot be compared with effective sewage treatment which returns relatively pure water to the watercourse. There are many objections to most of the present industrial waste treatment. Usually the effluent, although less objectionable, still contains more chemicals than the influent, and thus it has a strange taste or is unpotable. It is often disturbing or fatal to organisms on which effective sewage disposal depends. Although it may be legally adjudged as fit for man or beast, it may not be acceptable for industrial use! Also, it may be unusable when it is re-treated downstream or when evaporation reconcentrates its poisons above maximum allowable limits. Property values along polluted watercourses will steadily decline, as will commercial fishing, recreation, and resort enterprises. Underground water supplies are damaged, and in the streams treated industrial wastes often yield precipitates which coat the bottom and upset the ecology. The aesthetic beauty and the recreational satisfaction of life at a scenic body of pure water will be lost. This last value is priceless, particularly in a crowded and troubled world.

If the policy of conventional waste water treatment is followed, pollution will continue to increase. The population in the lowlands will be driven away, as it has been through the ages wherever potable, fresh water is no longer available. The rise of the vast, rich industrial complex in the United States has been compounding its own trouble, drop by deadly drop. New treatment methods are not visualized as a solution to the foul water problem in the near future; hence, a radically different course is proposed.

¹ Both aerobic and anaerobic decomposition may be used to treat sewage and some chemicals.

ISOLATION METHOD

The crux of the pollution problem is the prevention of industrial waste from entering any part of the nation's water supply, thus avoiding its contamination and permitting effective sewage treatment. This means that industrial waste may not enter any body of water, including tidewater, in any manner² or be dumped on the soil where it could eventually leach into some water supply by the action of rain water. The key, therefore, is isolation of industrial waste.

All industrial waste must, therefore, be collected by pipeline or transport into its own system, which may be either public or private depending on distances and convenience of administration. A monitoring system to police the sewers of a city and control the wastes entering them will be necessary.

Industrial wastes may be concentrated by private or public plants. Local recovery after concentration could very well become profitable. Also, it might be more economical to concentrate the material locally and transport it than to build and maintain long separate industrial waste collection lines. Methods of concentration may include evaporation (including fractional and destructive distillation), chemical change, and precipitation. Evaporation will probably be the cheapest. If a great amount of evaporation is involved, leakproof, inertly lined evaporation basins may be used, with open sides and roofs to prevent redilution by rain. Waste sprays would increase evaporation as would heat. Concentration may be accelerated physically by using evaporators, heaters, distillers, and chemicals. If fractional distillation is involved, for example, economic recovery of valuable substances may result directly. Depending on the substances involved, concentration may be carried to the liquid state or by destructive distillation to the solid state. In some few instances certain wastes may be commercially valuable without first concentrating them.

If recovery is not attempted, it may not always be necessary to go through the concentration stage. In such cases, it may be desirable to isolate, collect, and dispose of the wastes as they are.

In any event, regardless of how many of the above steps are taken, there will usually be an undesirable product remaining which will require disposal.

DISPOSAL

Material which must be disposed of can be carried to the ocean depths beyond the continental shelf and dropped to the bottom in suitable containers, in the same way that some radioactive wastes are handled. But this method would be very expensive. Only when an industrial waste, reduced to the solid state, is insoluble in water may it be dumped in the open. An alternative would be to provide dry storage dumps or safe containers.

Since most potable water occurs either on the surface of the earth or within a few hundred feet of the surface, it is possible safely to dispose of industrial wastes deep underground. The one basic criterion is that it must never contaminate the potable water supply. Some progressive, forward-looking states require that salt water which comes to the surface with crude petroleum or gas must be returned to some deep, safe stratum which is sufficiently porous to re-

² The only exceptions would be where the industrial waste is a substance, such as lime water or sulphur water which is native to the watercourse, and which is in concentrations not higher than those already native to the watercourse, and which will not upset the ecology, potability, or usability of the water.

ceive it. This is one good clue to disposal. Liquid wastes could be dumped down a tightly cased drill hole which extends at least 1,000 feet below sea level, and preferably deeper. (A city of 5,000 feet elevation above sea level would need a cased hole at least 6,000 feet deep.) The hole should be drilled to the bottom of the porous stratum selected so as to present as much absorbing surface as possible. Geological and chemical engineers should be consulted for drilling and maintaining such an installation. Abandoned shafts may sometimes be found which are adequate to receive liquid industrial waste. Suspended solids in the wastes would have to be smaller than the smallest interstices between granules in the porous stratum that would receive them. There should be no physical or chemical bonding to block the pores and the liquid waste should have a low viscosity to permit free flow through the porous stratum. Primary treatment should meet these criteria.

In summary, the following possibilities to be considered in any economic study of the disposal of industrial waste are proposed: solidify wastes into a safe water-insoluble material and store above ground; store water-soluble solids in containers or in bulk in dry storage protected from rain or surface water; pump or drain liquids down to a deep safe porous stratum underground; transport and dump wastes in the ocean depths. Any method selected generally will be expensive.

AIR POLLUTION

While water pollution should receive the highest priority nationally, it should be borne in mind that contaminated air is also a killer. In certain areas, air pollution is acute, with industrial airborne wastes the culprit. There are even traces of pollution in rain water because of air pollution.

Also certain chemicals used as insecticides and weed killers leave a residue having a lingering toxic effect which should be considered from the viewpoint of general public health and safety in pollution abatement in water and air. It may be necessary to precipitate electronically or to wash with water the airborne wastes, to remove particles and to dissolve or absorb the toxicants. Water or solvent used in this process would be treated as liquid industrial waste (which it then would be). It may also be necessary to refine fossil fuels to eliminate sulphur and perhaps some other substances to prevent air contamination. Completely burned, pure hydrocarbons yield carbon dioxide and water vapors, both of which are native to the atmosphere. Heat and energy without combustion, such as from atomic energy, may represent a partial future solution to air pollution abatement. The problem of contaminated air should be vigorously pursued before it reaches the proportions of the ugly water pollution specter.

CONCLUSION

One over-all project for treating both sewage and industrial waste to meet current criteria has been estimated to cost \$50 billion to \$60 billion. It includes separation of storm water from sewage, treatment of all sewage, and treatment of industrial waste. This would result in a very expensive improvement of some of the water supply, particularly at the higher elevations. It would remove sewage pollution from the lower reaches of the watercourses, but the treated industrial waste would still be present with its obnoxious effects, making the water undrinkable and sufficiently toxic to be unusable. The ecological cycle of nature would be unbalanced at the lower elevations where the greatest concentration of population occurs. One step further is essential—to isolate and dispose of industrial wastes. This would require a separate collection system plus the equipment to concentrate, recover, and final-

ly dispose of the residue as outlined. Estimates of cost for a complete job over a number of years run as high as \$100 billion. This is roughly equal to a year's Federal budget, the cost of a few years of manned space exploration, or twice the yearly defense budget, but it is the minimum necessary to ensure safety for the future.

In order to control water pollution it is necessary to install new sewage collection and disposal systems and to expand present systems; to separate all sanitary and storm sewage systems; and to add an industrial waste system, with each system isolated from the other two. Sanitary lines must be connected to a sewer or septic tank and the sewage treated; marine sewage and animal waste must be collected and disposed of in shore facilities; and the total effect of insecticides and weed-killing chemicals must be determined and necessary corrective actions taken.

Except in rare cases, industrial waste cannot be effectively treated and returned to the water supply as can sanitary sewage. The keynote is total isolation of industrial waste. After isolation and concentration, economic recovery of some chemicals may follow. The solid or liquid residual waste must not be returned to the water supply. Non-water soluble solid waste residue presents no problem. Soluble solid or liquid waste residue must be held in containers or stored in dry land areas or in the sea beyond continental shelf. Liquid waste may be piped underground to some porous stratum well below sea level. As progress is made, pollution criteria must be upgraded in each instance until the filth in lower grade waters is eliminated. Raising the criteria and improving the techniques and facilities must continue until the lower watercourses are again fresh. Then, all water may be maintained at a high level of purity.

The strange taste in much of the water supply, first noticeable years ago and which has now reached the objectionable level, took years to build up. Old treatment methods are not a cure—only an expensive postponement of disaster. The cause must be eliminated now or the dregs of industrial might will ruin the most precious of all natural resources—pure water.

ADVANTAGES OF THE ISOLATION OF INDUSTRIAL WASTE

1. No treated or raw industrial waste would be allowed to enter fresh water.
2. The nation's fresh water supply would be effectively increased, and the quality greatly improved.
3. Little is known of the total effects of many of the substances from industrial wastes. How do they effect such things as physical and mental health, attitude, mutation, and the like? The method proposed would eliminate this enigma by removing the cause.
4. Less fresh water would be used in the process, because the degree of dilution would have a direct bearing on the cost. The more water used in the process and entering the waste, the more fresh water would have to be removed by evaporation or distillation.
5. No good water would be used to dilute the treated industrial waste effluent, because there is no treatment and no effluent to return to the watercourse.
6. Fresh water would be recovered by evaporation or distillation from the industrial waste when it is concentrated as part of the process.
7. Recovery of chemicals would reduce cost, and could become profitable.
8. Sewage disposal would be practical over the full length of a watercourse, since there would be no industrial waste chemicals in the water to prevent effective sewage disposal.

9. Expensive and only partially satisfactory treatment to make contaminated water potable would be avoided.

10. With the return of fresh water to the watercourses, beauty would replace ugliness; parks, resorts, and recreation areas would replace polluted areas where rats and trash now abound; and the specter of death would be replaced with the vigor and satisfaction of productive life.

MORE YELLOW PAGES, MORE BLUE SKY
(By W. L. Guthrie, Chairman, Pure Air Committee, IWLA)

Let your fingers do the walking through the Yellow Pages of plumbing supplies, garbage disposal units, salvage or service operations for earthbound waste of every type.

Who is in business dealing with the fifty million tons of scrap poured into the sky each week?

When the man on the radio says "air pollution control is everyone's business," he is only kidding.

Resolution number two of the Florida Division means business, and business will be good.

Listen to the sound of a new breeze stirring, of fresh folding money in motion. Now therefore be it resolved that the Florida Division of Izaak Walton League in Directors' Meeting in Silver Springs, Florida on November 28-29, 1964, recognizes that the air is not the proper place to dump wastes and be it further resolved that the League believes a nationwide tonnage fine for aerial disposition of waste material is the logical, effective basis for the retention of waste products.

"Wait a minute!" you say, "We want to prevent air pollution, not license it! What are you Florida people sniffing, besides glue?" For one thing, relatively clean air. For another business. Big business. Billions of dollars worth of equipment will be designed, manufactured, sold, installed, serviced, replaced by better equipment. Billions of dollars worth of material will be salvaged for re-use, material now abandoned by its owners, poisoning the air.

"But we have no equipment designed or built to capture these wastes at the source." Neither did we have a way to send a man around the world in ninety minutes. Who can believe that the nation which proposes to send a man or men to the moon, and bring them back, cannot devise a way to capture material, gaseous or otherwise, already neatly funnelled through a long tube? Not us.

Can't afford it? We can't afford not to create more manufacturing capacity, more jobs. The cost of the equipment? You can remember when a ball pen cost fifteen dollars, and it wasn't very good at that. Today your wife can buy a handful of pens at the supermarket for thirty nine cents, and they are good pens. Why? Because there was a market for pens. Today there is no market for equipment to capture the waste pouring from those discharge tubes called "smokestacks" and "tailpipes".

There is no market today because the cost of aerial dumping, that is to say, the cost of dirty air, is a concealed cost. It is the cost of a new set of drapes. It is the cost of repainting your house. It is the cost of hospitalization. It is the millions voted by Congress in the Clean Air Act. Today these costs are not directly and correctly reflected in the price lists of the goods and services: the production of which causes waste to be discharged into the air. The heart of success is good accounting, and this is not good accounting. The business world cannot exist without accounting, and business accounting is done in dollars, not subjective judgments.

It can reasonably be hoped that a substantial segment of American industry, after an initial and automatic scream of "foul!" will recognize that here for the first time, in the procedure of "dump a ton, pay for a ton",

is relief from the endless battles with neighbors, relief from the necessity to make decisions without any reasonable criteria, relief from competitive problems stemming from unequal treatment, relief from the endless harassment by government at every level, government which itself has no reasonable criteria.

And there will be relief from what we thought was an "Air Pollution Problem". It was not. It was a waste disposal problem, all along. If we can do without seeming to beat a dead horse, let us examine some of the terms and concepts stemming from this mis-identification of the problem.

Confucius said that "when what is said is not what is meant, then that which ought to be done is not done, and the people stand about in helpless confusion". He was talking about air pollution terminology, and procedure, traditional style. For example, an article may be titled "The Control of Air Pollution". Everyone knows that a mass of dirty air cannot be held on a siding in the sky, it cannot be herded to a remote spot there to be freshened by rains, for on our little space ship earth there are no remote spots. It cannot be graded like potatoes, and assigned county by county, so many rotten spots to this, so many rotten spots to that, as envisioned by the establishment of county by county "Air Quality Standards", which is itself a euphemism for air pollution standards. Nor can this mass of dirty air be cleaned up by man, for it will scatter and merge with other dirty air from the four corners of the earth.

What is meant then by "The Control of Air Pollution?" Surely what is meant is the retention of waste products. Resolution number two names this as the business at hand. Nobody ever talked about "The Control of Itching Caused by Fleas". Who wants to itch?

Again, it is said, that a certain city's "Air Pollution Problem" is caused by a range of mountains, preventing the out flow of the polluted air. Nonsense. The air pollution is caused by dumping so many tons of waste in the air.

Is air pollution caused by an inversion in temperature in God's own sky? No, it is caused by dumping so many tons of waste in the air.

Is air pollution caused by the improper location of a large stack where tons of fuel are used? Not at all. The location of a stack has nothing to do with the tonnage discharged. The location may affect the number of complaints directed to that particular discharge facility. Hopefully, stacks have been located with an eye to the loss of identity of the plume in the general gloom. It has been a fairly successful dodge, what with the cooperation of a weather reporting which carelessly calls smoke from somebody else's town "haze".

To pollute means to soil. To soil is to misplace material. Air has many contaminants, some placed there by nature, mostly placed there by man. But they are pollutants, or contaminants, and to say that they are not in fact pollutants until they reach such and such a concentration, as does the classicist in "air pollution control" work, is to blow the old ball game in the first inning.

As for "Air Quality Standards" no one has been able to agree on just how much sulphur dioxide ought to be in the air. By law it is so many parts per million, with a different law in each locality. If air pollution standards are desirable, then standards ought to be set up for other unwanted phenomena. Thus we could look forward to a goal of so many murders per month, so many accidents per day, so many new cases of emphysema per week per hospital. Which of you will volunteer to fill the quotas decided upon?

Resolution number two does not ignore a standard. It has one. The best and most effective standard in the world, the dollar.

It should be understood that the invaluable work done by the physician in determining that dirty air is harmful to health, the economists tabulation of the damage to physical property, the agriculturists detailing of damage to crops, the endless charts and tables showing the various combinations of temperature, velocity, pollutants, time, dewpoint, pollutant origin, and so on, this work was invaluable for one reason—it indicated clearly that the air is not the proper place to dump wastes. These works provided not the slightest clue to the best way to prevent aerial dumping.

Resolution number two says the best way is to put waste material on a business basis. Not government business, private business. If the Federal Government will simply take the position that the dumping of private property (waste material) in the nation's sky is undesirable, and set a time schedule of dumping fines as a deterrent, we will see American ingenuity, American private enterprise, American can do produce new Yellow Pages and a clearer sky than you might dream possible.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN AMVETS (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 13284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13284) to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this measure has been cleared with the majority leadership, the minority leadership, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], to which there was referred a companion bill, which was introduced in the Senate (S. 3336) on May 10, 1966.

Mr. President, this bill was passed by the House of Representatives today. It is very similar to the bill that the Senate previously passed today for the American Legion. The bill would amend the charter of AMVETS to admit the cold war veterans to membership in AMVETS.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do I understand that what we are doing now is adopting the House bill that came over this afternoon?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We hope to adopt the House bill that came over this afternoon.

Mr. DOMINICK. I commend the Senator for taking the initiative in connection with this measure. I think that it is an excellent bill and I hope that it passes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his approval of the bill and the expression of his hope that the bill is passed.

Mr. President, the bill has been approved by the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLITICAL USE OF THE USIA FILM "JOHN F. KENNEDY—YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on the front page of today's Washington Post is published an article written by George Lardner, Jr., entitled "USIA's Film on Kennedy Booked in Political Drive."

The article states that a Wisconsin Democrat, who is running for the House of Representatives against incumbent Republican Glen R. Davis, acknowledged that the U.S. Information Agency film, "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," will be used to help raise money to finance his campaign. Apparently the film will be shown on September 28 as a "Midwest Premiere," with tickets being sold at \$5 per person and \$25 for reserved seats. Seventy percent of the profits will be used for Democratic campaigning and 30 percent will go to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. President, I well recall that on August 26, 1965, the Senate passed a resolution, reciting that we wished to make an exception to the law which prohibits USIA films from being shown anywhere except overseas. USIA is, of course, designed for overseas activities and not for domestic activities. Nevertheless, we felt that the law should be modified to permit the American people to see this film about the late President.

The Senate joint resolution authorized USIA to transfer six master copies of the film to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the exclusive rights for the center to distribute these copies. The resolution also provided as follows:

The net proceeds resulting from any such distribution shall be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

This specific provision of the resolution was reinforced by the following language contained in the committee report which accompanied the resolution and is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 16, page 22070:

The committee agreed that there should be no partisan political consideration in the arrangements made for distributing the film

in the United States and that there should be no showing of the film, as at a political convention, for example, which would serve a partisan political purpose.

In view of the specific provision written into the resolution, coupled with the intention of the committee above set forth, which was certainly considered by the Senate, I find this action taken by the Milwaukee County Democratic Committee and the Democratic candidate a most brazen and contemptible violation of the rights of taxpayers whose taxes paid for the film and of the policy of the Congress of the United States. All of the net profits from this showing should go to the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—and not just that portion which a few Wisconsin Democrats see fit to transfer to the Center. I would guess that the late President would turn over in his grave if he knew the abuse and misuse proposed to be made of this film by a few greedy members of his own party.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 25, 1966:

S. 642. An act for the relief of Chung K. Won; and

S. 2104. An act for the relief of Harriet C. Chambers.

On August 30, 1966:

S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED ON OTHER THAN A COMPETITIVE BID BASIS

A letter from the Assistant Commander for Contracts, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded on other than

a competitive bid basis, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Export Control, for the second quarter of 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense Procurement from small and other business firms, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CLEARINGHOUSE FOR COMMERCIAL AND PROCUREMENT STANDARDS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote and support representation of United States interests in voluntary international commercial standards activities, to establish a clearinghouse for commercial and procurement standards, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to establish fees for furnishing abstracts of medical records and related services to private parties, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated August 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements of Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR LOANS UNDER THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application by the Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 5 of Brownsville, Tex., for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application by the North Poudre Irrigation Co. of Wellington, Colo., for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application by the North Extension Canal Co. of Grace, Idaho, for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON MINERALS EXPLORATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the minerals exploration assistance program,

for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2979. A bill to extend coverage of the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to the territory of Guam (Rept. No. 1554).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3433. A bill to make it a criminal offense to steal, embezzle, or otherwise unlawfully take property from a pipeline (Rept. No. 1555).

By Mrs. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for a study of the impact of overhead electric transmission lines and towers upon scenic assets, zoning and community planning, property values, and real estate revenues (Rept. No. 1556).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 8058. An act to amend section 4 of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (Rept. No. 1558).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 11428. An act to amend the Act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront (Rept. No. 1579).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 293. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1557).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3784. A bill to amend the act incorporating The American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership (Rept. No. 1559);

H.R. 2349. An act for the relief of Robert Dean Ward (Rept. No. 1560);

H.R. 3671. An act for the relief of Josephine Ann Belizia (Rept. No. 1561);

H.R. 4075. An act for the relief of John F. Reagan, Jr. (Rept. No. 1562);

H.R. 6305. An act for the relief of lessees of a certain tract of land in Logtown, Miss. (Rept. No. 1566);

H.R. 6606. An act for the relief of Li Tsu (Nako) Chen (Rept. No. 1567);

H.R. 7141. An act for the relief of Ronald Whelan (Rept. No. 1568);

H.R. 7446. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Department of the Navy at the Norfolk Navy Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va. (Rept. No. 1569);

H.R. 7671. An act for the relief of Sophia Soliwoda (Rept. No. 1570);

H.R. 10656. An act for the relief of Kimberly Ann Yang (Rept. No. 1571);

H.R. 10990. An act for the relief of Maj. Alan DeYoung, U.S. Army (Rept. No. 1572);

H.R. 11038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna S. Bettendorf (Rept. No. 1573);

H.R. 11251. An act for the relief of Hubert J. Kupper (Rept. No. 1574);

H.R. 11271. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of

Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill. (Rept. No. 1575);

H.R. 11347. An act for the relief of Maria Anna Plotrowski, formerly Czeslawa Marek (Rept. No. 1576);

H.R. 11844. An act for the relief of Maria Giuseppina Innalfo Feole (Rept. No. 1577); and

H.R. 12950. An act for the relief of Kazimierz (Casimer) Krzykowski (Rept. No. 1578).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 14379. An act for the relief of John R. McKinney (Rept. No. 1564); and

H.R. 14514. An act for the relief of Vernon M. Nicholas (Rept. No. 1565).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash. (Rept. No. 1563).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendments:

S. 3389. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1583).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. 3230. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to negotiate cooperative agreements granting concessions at the National Zoological Park to certain nonprofit organizations and to accept voluntary services of such organizations or of individuals, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1580).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. 3553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Brooks (Rept. No. 1581).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1515. A bill to include the construction of an additional span as part of the authorized reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi at Rock Island, Ill. (Rept. No. 1582).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 3787. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia:

S. 3788. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to or on behalf of the city of Savannah and Chatham County, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3789. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kyung Hye Suh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3790. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis G. Dediot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3791. A bill to promote and support representation of U.S. interests in voluntary international commercial standards activities, to establish a clearinghouse for commercial and procurement standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3792. A bill for the relief of T. Sgt. Anthony J. Corso, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE WITH RESPECT TO TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HART, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. INOUE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, and Mr. TALMADGE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 300) to express sense of Senate with respect to troop deployment in Europe, which was ordered to lie on the desk until September 6, 1966, without reference.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION OF U.S. INTERESTS IN VOLUNTARY INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL STANDARDS ACTIVITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, a bill to promote and support representation of U.S. interests in voluntary international commercial standards activities, to establish a clearinghouse for commercial and procurement standards, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary, together with a statement prepared by him, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3791) to promote and support representation of U.S. interests in voluntary international commercial standards activities, to establish a clearinghouse for commercial procurement standards, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1966.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To promote and support representation of United States interests in voluntary international commercial standards activities, to establish a clearinghouse for commercial and procurement standards, and for other purposes." and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

[From the U.S. Department of Commerce]
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED
INTRODUCTION

The National Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce has traditionally provided technical support to the activity of U.S. industry in voluntarily developing domestic standards for the United States. The proposed legislation is needed to clarify the authority of the Department through its National Bureau of Standards to promote and participate similarly in voluntary international standardization activities on behalf of U.S. interests.

Since 1921 the National Bureau of Standards has provided industry and commerce of the United States with substantial technical and administrative assistance in the development and publication of standards for products and commodities and of simplified practices directed to the reduction of sizes and styles. Professional personnel of the Bureau have served on technical committees of many domestic standardization bodies and a limited number of international committees and have led in the development of technically competent engineering standards oriented principally to the performance criteria. The National Bureau of Standards publishes product standards covering many items, particularly when standardization of these items cannot reasonably be accomplished through private standardization organizations.

II. THE ROLE OF STANDARDS IN COMMERCE

Standards are the language of commerce. The seller is encouraged to market new products, confident that by meeting compatible, reliable and accepted standards they will be bought by consumers. The buyer is encouraged to buy because he is assured of a product that meets his requirements and specifications. The establishment of a standard permits, what would otherwise be virtually a hopeless task, the interchangeability of parts. Indeed the whole concept of mass production is based on such a capability.

Interchangeability permits decentralization of manufacturing plants, locating them most advantageously with respect to energy sources, raw materials, labor force, or proximity to market. It permits the greatest number of companies, large and small, to share in the industrial activity. It fosters innovation and the establishment of new businesses by assuring both the entrepreneur and the customer that the new product meets commonly accepted standards. It allows specialization of labor, with all the efficiencies which that brings. Finally, it facilitates control and automation of production processes. It is evident that an excellent system of standards in the United States, therefore, has significantly stimulated the growth of the American economy and the achievement of the highest standards of living in the world. The development of an international system of standards similar to the national system of this country would—

Provide the atmosphere in which the United States could compete in world markets on an equal footing with other nations, not handicapped by standards that are incompatible with our own.

Stimulate the economy of all nations, and thereby our own.

Facilitate the maturing of the underdeveloped nations, thereby increasing trade opportunities for all nations and reducing the need for foreign support programs.

An effective system of international standards, therefore, will tend to do for all countries what U.S. standards do for us. All nations will be able to exploit their special skills and technologies so as to participate more fully in world economic activity, benefiting not only themselves but other nations

as well. It is an economic axiom that a thriving economy in one region depends on a thriving economy in all regions.

III. CURRENT SITUATION AND NEED IN STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

A. Development and acceptance of international standards

Standards activity in the United States is basically a voluntary activity with the Federal Government, primarily the National Bureau of Standards, providing technical support.

Likewise, in the field of international standards, involving sovereign nations, standards activity is voluntary because there must be agreement among participating countries to develop and accept a given set of standards. Agreement in connection with international commercial or engineering standards is brought about chiefly through the efforts of such groups as the Organization for International Standardization (ISO), International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), and Pan American Standards Commission (COPANT). The American Standards Association (ASA) represents the United States unofficially in ISO, IEC, and other international standards organizations, and enlists the technical assistance of both industry and the Federal Government in its international committee activities.

B. Participation in international standardization activities

Participation by U.S. industry in international standardization activities through ASA has been strong in some fields, such as photography, electronics and automatic data processing, but other fields such as rubber goods, packaging, cast iron pipe, and electrical instruments have received little support. Generally, the U.S. has not participated in international standards work at a level commensurate with American interest and capabilities. In some areas American interests have been at a disadvantage in international markets from lack of active participation in the development of an international standard.

Where U.S. industry cannot or does not choose to participate actively in international standards work, ASA looks to other organizations and the Federal Government for technical or financial assistance and support. Reasons for limited industry participation in international standards activities are generally due to a lack of understanding or interest in international standards activities; considerations of short-term gains in special areas rather than the long-range potential impact on the economic welfare of the U.S. as a whole; and the relatively high cost of financing delegates, secretariats and chairmanships.

C. Effect of inadequate participation

Inadequate U.S. participation has on occasion resulted in the adoption of standards which put American goods and services at a disadvantage in world trade. For example, some years ago when the Swiss Government placed a ban on the use of American sealed beam headlights because they were deemed ineffective on the sharp-turned, steep-graded Swiss roads, ISO distributed the Swiss standard to other nations which would have prohibited the use of United States' sealed beam headlights. Before the ISO recommendation was adopted, however, U.S. industry decided to participate in the ISO project and the recommendation which was ultimately approved enabled the United States to continue the export of headlights in the world market. Similarly, prior to World War II Germany translated an existing American standard for 16 mm sound film but placed the sound track on the side of the film opposite to U.S. practice. Germany promoted the adoption of the translated

standard in its own and various European countries, thus, effectively blocking exports of American equipment involving the photographic and motion picture film industries. Here again U.S. efforts through ASA were successful in removing the export barrier. The ASA standard remains in effect today as an ISO standard.

However, not all such situations have been so favorably resolved. For example, at the present time there are differences between European and American standards in the depth and thread of lamp socket and lamp base which reduce U.S. exports for these items. Also draft standards on leather and cement and on color television currently under consideration as international standards, which are different than American standards, may if adopted, become barriers to U.S. export expansion. The absence of an international standard for a system of symbols for marking textiles makes it necessary for U.S. manufacturers to mark shipments in accord with the symbol system of each country, an expense that may make continued trade in this sector in the world market uneconomical.

D. Need for proposed legislation

The proposed legislation is needed to clarify the authority of the Department of Commerce, through its National Bureau of Standards, to promote and participate in voluntary international standardization activities on behalf of United States interests. It is necessary also to provide authority for the issuance of grants to qualified private non-profit organizations for the promotion and development of international standards in association with foreign standards-making bodies. Finally, it is needed to provide the authority to issue grants to qualified private non-profit organizations for establishment and maintenance of a clearinghouse and clearinghouse services for the collection and dissemination of private and public engineering or product standards.

As may be seen from the examples of the effect of inadequate participation given above, there is a compelling need for a program of more adequate participation by the Federal Government in international standardization activities in order to provide—

Support for international standards work in the national interest where industry for some reason is reluctant or unable to participate.

Technical support, committee leadership, and coordinated standards development by Federal agencies, such as the National Bureau of Standards, where unique or outstanding competence exists.

An objective, long-range approach to international standards development, especially in instances where the goals to be reached are public as well as private, as in cases where it would be desirable to coordinate standards development with foreign aid programs.

Cooperation with foreign standards-making bodies, particularly in underdeveloped countries, to assure the best possible standards systems. This serves two ends—it makes the countries involved more self-sufficient, and it assures United States industry of an equal opportunity to compete for trade rather than to be faced with standards set up by other, more aggressive nations which weaken the U.S. position.

The translation, publication, and distribution of U.S. standards, and the support of standards libraries in countries where standards work is starting to grow. Again, this would tend to put United States industry on a more equal footing with that of such nations as the United Kingdom and West Germany, which have tended to move quickly into a newly developing area to set up a preferred position with respect to standards.

Development of international standards is considerably complicated by the fact that there are different systems of measurement and standards—metric, English, and others.

With the rest of the world moving in the direction of adopting the metric system, the United States is put at a disadvantage that can be minimized only by greater participation in international standards activities.

A larger role by the Federal Government in stimulating development of compatible international standards is necessary if barriers to the interchange of goods and services are to be minimized and a competitive free economy in the world market maintained. An effort to increase common or compatible international standards, to reconcile standards differences, and to help develop as broad a trade base as possible in international markets is essential. The proposed legislation is aimed at supporting the development of a strong and growing trade in present markets and markets of tomorrow through early and effective participation in international standards activities, on the part of U.S. industry, professional organizations and the Federal Government.

Industrially developed nations, such as those in Western Europe, have recognized the direct relationship between their export trade in world commerce and the standards generated in new or less industrialized nations. These European nations thus have moved quickly to assist standards-making bodies of other nations develop their standards and standards-related activities.

The proposed legislation will enable the Federal Government to protect and improve the economic position of American industry by increasing U.S. participation and cooperation with foreign standards-making bodies in their standards activities. Its purpose, therefore, by such means of cooperation and participation, is to encourage and promote the generation or adoption of standards common or compatible with American standards. Appropriate U.S. activities in this connection would include supporting missions to provide consultative and technical advice on training, organizing, managing, and developing commercial or engineering standards systems and activities, including demonstration laboratories; supporting studies of regional or national standards efforts, including recommendations as to what future steps to take; and providing new and less industrialized nations copies of U.S.A. standards or translations.

IV. STANDARDS CLEARINGHOUSE

A. Current situation

A great inhibitor to progress in the development and use of standards, both domestic and international, is the lack of communication among the many organizations and agencies that issue standards, as well as the users of standards. All standards-producing bodies have developed some way of publishing and distributing information concerning their standards. However, the systems used by standards-producing bodies vary.

System differences in nomenclature, format, classification of subject matter, and lack of coordination with modern current data retrieval systems, lead to widespread difficulty in locating, understanding and applying standards to current operations. Indeed, government and industry frequently find it difficult to determine whether a standard even exists. No central focal point is presently available to provide a potential user of a standard with a uniform, comprehensive catalog of standards.

Under the circumstances adequate use of a standard, in its own or technologically related fields, cannot be made. Duplicative standards cannot be eliminated. Appropriate revisions of outmoded standards cannot, without great difficulty, be undertaken.

B. The need—A clearinghouse

There is need for a Clearinghouse for commercial and procurement standards which will have the following functions:

1. Development of an improved library of standards and government specifications. This will serve as a central source of information on standards and standardizing efforts.

2. Providing a central focal point to which a potential industrial, institutional or governmental user of a standard can refer in order to become aware of the existence of the standard.

3. Development and maintenance of a catalog of existing standards. Such a catalog will go far in eliminating differences in nomenclature, format, etc., which make the present information so unsatisfactory.

4. Development of a central retrieval system to provide a quick and inexpensive route to the information contained in this comprehensive catalog. This would make available to subscribers information on such items as titles, numbers, subject matter, technical societies, trade associations, and committee activities on domestic and international levels.

In sum, it should be realized that international standards are very much a part of world trade and that foreign standards-making bodies are constantly at work with programs aimed at the improvement and broader application of those standards. Thus, while it may well be argued that international standards do not encompass the depth and breadth of American standards, it nevertheless behooves the United States to step-up its participation in international standardization activities, not merely to combat competition being waged in foreign countries against American products and services but to expand hitherto undeveloped markets for American industry and commerce. The essentiality of our participation in this area therefore, stated in its most simple terms, is to achieve compatibility for our products based on standards deemed acceptable to foreign methods of operations and systems as well as our own so as to stem the reduction or prevent the exclusion of our sales to foreign markets.

Finally, our cooperation with the emerging nations in developing and improving their commercial standards, which are likely to result in standards patterned largely after our own, will make American products more accessible to their markets, thereby enhancing our economy. More significantly perhaps, such service may reasonably be expected to rally support from such nations for our efforts with foreign standards-making bodies to adopt, whenever possible, American standards as international standards. Such adoption would provide further markets for American industry. This then is the purpose and design of the proposed legislation, whose goal hopefully may be realized from its enactment.

V. SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the legislation shows a recognition by Congress that voluntary standardization of products, both on a national and international basis, promotes the exchange of goods of high quality to the benefit of the general public. The bill states as its purpose in support of this Congressional finding, the promotion and support of representation for United States interests in voluntary international commercial standardization activities and the establishment of information clearinghouses for commercial or procurement standards for the benefit of all concerned.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other interested private and governmental agencies, to promote and support United States participation in the international

commercial standardization of products, processes and test methods, through appropriate international organizations, for the purpose of promulgating international commercial standards for products, processes and test methods. He would also be authorized to establish a clearinghouse service for the benefit of producers, distributors, users, consumers and the public. The clearinghouse would collect and disseminate engineering or product standards and governmental procurement standards and information relating to those standards from whatever sources that might be available. This data would then be provided to all those having a desire or need for it.

Section 3 would enable the Secretary to carry out the functions described in section 2 by authorizing him to make grants or contracts with any private non-profit standards organization which he determines represents the interests of those groups which this bill is designed to benefit and which permit participation in the organization by such interests.

Also he would be permitted to enter into contracts or cooperative arrangements with anyone whom he thought qualified to carry out the functions authorized under the Act. Finally, he would be authorized to establish procedures and issue rules and regulations necessary to administer the Act and carry out its designated functions. This latter authority would include the right to fix prices and set fees for the information furnished or services rendered in connection with clearinghouse activities without regard to any other law under which Government sales are permitted. Such a practice is deemed consistent with Congressional and executive policy to recover from the special users of the clearinghouse information and services, a substantial portion of the cost of obtaining and producing the data. The Secretary would be authorized to use the working capital fund of the National Bureau of Standards in administering the Act.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize appropriations, without fiscal year limitation, of such sums as may be deemed necessary for the purposes of the Act.

Section 5 requires that those who receive financial assistance under the proposed legislation keep such records as may be necessary for the purposes of audit and examination relating to the receipt and disposition of funds provided under the Act.

AMENDMENT OF FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT AND THE MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 786

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9918) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 298, to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, remain at the desk for another week in order to permit additional Senators to cosponsor the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE ON RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Reynold E. Carlson, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia, and Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 31, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Statement delivered by him and excerpts of a speech delivered by the Vice President to a group of air cadets from Canada in connection with the international air cadet exchange program.

CLAIMS OF U.S. CITIZENS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on September 1, 1965, I introduced a bill to permit American citizens to file claims against the Chinese Communist Government for expropriation, unpaid debts, and other unlawful injuries.

This bill, S. 2484, is the same as the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], S. 3675, which was favorably reported to the Senate yesterday.

I am, of course, pleased by the Foreign Relations Committee's action and I urge prompt approval of this legislation by the Senate.

In 1964, a similar proposal with respect to the filing claims against the Castro government was signed into law.

Neither measure authorizes any appropriation of funds to pay these claims. They simply provide some remedy for those of our citizens who have been victimized by Communist outlawry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement I made in the Senate when I introduced my Chinese claims bill last year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in 1954 Congress established the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

to adjudicate claims by United States citizens against foreign countries which have seized their property.

During the past 15 years, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and its predecessors have made awards to claimants from funds available as part of settlements with the United States by Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In other cases, where no settlement on claims has been reached between the United States and the expropriating nation, Congress has empowered the Commission to determine the validity and amount of United States citizens' claims against the expropriating country anyway, but payment of the claims has been made only from assets of the foreign government in the possession of the United States.

Where there have been no such assets, no payment has been made at all.

In this latter class of cases, in which no assets exist from which payment can be made, the Commission nonetheless determines the merits and the amounts of the claims in order to decide and record the facts of each case and in order to provide the Secretary of State with an intelligent basis upon which to negotiate with the expropriating power, should it be determined prudent to do so.

Last year Congress expanded the jurisdiction of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to include determination of the amount and the validity of claims by United States citizens against the Government of Cuba which have arisen as a result of the Castro government's bad credit, expropriation, and lawlessness against United States citizens.

That legislation specifically provided that it could not be construed as authorizing an appropriation for the purpose of paying these Cuban claims.

I think the Cuban Claims Act was a wise piece of legislation.

But I think the jurisdiction of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission should also be extended to include claims of United States citizens against the Chinese Communist Government for expropriation, unpaid debts, and other unlawful injuries. Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Foreign Claims Commission to hear, decide, and record these claims against the day when Communist China can be brought to the bar of international law and justice.

The bill I propose in no way changes the provisions of the Cuban Claims Act passed last year, except to allow the Commission to adjudicate claims of U.S. citizens against Communist China on the same basis as claims against Cuba.

This bill, like the Cuban Claims Act, will not involve or authorize any appropriation of funds to pay these claims.

But it will provide some remedy for those of our citizens who have been victimized by the outlawry of Communist China.

BRITAIN NEEDS A SECOND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as long ago as last August I have commented on the British economic situation, and suggested that the United States join others in OECD to provide substantial long-term assistance to the United Kingdom to help the modernization of the British production machine.

In my view, that is the fundamental problem underlying Britain's recurrent balance-of-payments crisis. I suggested

the creation of a \$10 billion modernization fund financed by loans from the United States and other industrialized nations, under the auspices of the World Bank as one means to bring about this modernization. I also proposed that we offer Britain a new trade arrangement—should it prove impossible for her to join the European Common Market within a reasonable time—leading toward a free trade area including the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, the EFTA countries and other industrialized nations including those in the EEC which agree to adhere to the provisions of such a free trade area, with special arrangements for developing nations.

On August 21 there appeared a challenging article in the New York Times Magazine analyzing Britain's basic economic problems and the recent measures taken by the Wilson government to deal with them. The article was written by Andrew Shonfield, director of studies, of Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs, and a noted economic authority. It is must reading on Britain's plight—one of the worst critical of the world's problems.

Mr. Shonfield is critical of the recent deflationary measures and the 6-month freeze of wages put into effect in Britain on the grounds that it will discourage investment in new plant and equipment and reduce rather than encourage labor mobility, both of which are needed desperately if the recurrent cycle of the balance of payments crises is to be broken. He blames the Wilson government for sacrificing long term change for short term balance of payments relief. He reports that manufacturing investment has already slowed down, imports of capital equipments are expected to decline as business slows down with the result that new productive capacity required for faster economic growth will not be built.

Mr. Shonfield concludes that only a reform of the structure of the British economy can solve Britain's problems and recommends higher rates of investment in productive equipment than in Europe, the systematic training of managers and skilled workers, higher wages to increase labor mobility, more credit to business for modernization, and most importantly, financial assistance from Britain's creditors abroad to provide the conditions necessary for a shift in Britain's industrial structure. He recommends that Britain's creditors be asked first, to give Britain till 1974 to repay the \$3 billion loaned to Britain to stem her last balance of payments crisis and due in 1970 and second, to extend to Britain a major international loan to permit 3 to 4 years respite from balance pressures, the purchase of necessary equipment abroad and the buildup of extra currency reserves.

I consider this article to be an extraordinarily perceptive analysis of the British economy, one which should be read with great care by us, as well as the Wilson government, and acted upon on high priority. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN NEEDS A SECOND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

(By Andrew Shonfield)

(NOTE.—Andrew Shonfield has been Director of Studies at Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs since 1961. He is the author of several books, including "British Economic Policy Since the War" and "Modern Capitalism.")

LONDON.—The other day, there was yet another successful get-away in broad daylight by several prisoners from Wormwood Scrubs, a gloomy old-fashioned jail in the middle of London. Asked about it, the Prison Officers' Association said it was the public, not the jailers, who should take the blame. An official of the association stated: "If the public demands a more liberal regime for prisoners, it must expect that it is easier for them to escape."

What he did not say was that British prisons, largely built in the 19th century, were designed to function efficiently on the basis of Victorian rules of discipline; changed ideas about the humane limits of discipline require new designs for prisons, new equipment for maximum security. Neither has been provided. Under-investment in prisons means that you need more prison warders, and these are hard to get in a country that is acutely short of manpower.

The prison story is typical of the dilemma of British life in a dozen different fields today. There is a general demand for progress, in methods of treating criminals in prisons, in handling the education of children, in expanding at a prodigious pace the numbers going to universities. All these things require the renovation of the basic equipment of the country. But there are at the same time so many other urgent bits of renovation clamoring to be done—roads, ports, factories—that each of the claimants has to be severely rationed. What this means in the end is that improvements take an inordinately long time. People get used to waiting. That is perhaps the most striking quality of English life today. At any rate, it is what strikes an Englishman hardest of all returning to his own country after a trip abroad.

Of course, the essential problem, which is the competition of many insistent demands on a limited stock of resources, is common to a number of other European countries. It is the result of the great shift in social expectations which has occurred since World War II. But in Britain the problem is more acute than anywhere else.

Part of the reason is obvious: the British economy is worse off because it has suffered from a longer period of neglect. But that only takes the problem one stage further back. Because output has been expanding slowly there has not been enough left over each year—after consumers have taken their share of the national product—to spend on the improvement of our national stock of capital.

It is noticeable that whereas the other West European countries normally devote between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of their national product to fixed investment, the proportion in Britain has been consistently below 20 per cent ever since the war. There is a vicious circle here: because output grows slowly there is too little available for investment in productive equipment, and because so little is invested output continues to be held down.

To take one example: the British machine tool industry is acknowledged to be far too small. Consequently, as soon as demand is strong, delivery times for British machine tools, both for the home trade and for export, tend to get too long. Customers are driven away and business is lost. But one of the reasons why the industry has stayed so

much smaller than the West German machine tool industry, for instance, is that the volume of orders for new machines coming forward steadily year after year from British factories has been much below the German level.

If the volume of British investment is to be increased, other demands on the nation's resources will have to be cut back. The obvious candidates for cuts are consumer spending and defense. Neither has so far been squeezed enough to insure the necessary shift in the balance of the British economy. Moreover, when the consumer spending is suddenly cut—as it is being now under the Wilson austerity program—businessmen respond by cutting back their investment, too. And the Government, whose way out of a crisis of the pound sterling is to deflate the economy at whatever cost to future growth, does not act to stop the cumulative rundown. On the contrary, it adds a few knocks of its own to vital public investment projects like highways and roads.

But it is not only the total amount of investment that is inadequate. There is clear evidence that, on average, a given quantity of investment yields a smaller return in Britain than in other European countries.

Of course, there are a number of extremely efficient British firms which show as high a return on their capital as their competitors abroad. If this were not so, British industry would not be able to sell the great quantities of goods which are exported each year. Out of every \$100 of British manufactures produced, \$30 are still being sold in foreign markets. There must therefore be a lot of British manufacturing concerns which can compete on level terms with the best abroad.

But when one looks at the performance of the ordinary business, rather than at the top group of firms, one finds that on average \$100 invested in British manufacturing industry in recent years has resulted in additional annual output of approximately \$20, compared with \$43 for an equivalent investment in France, and \$50 in Germany. (These figures are derived from an important new study, "The British Economy in 1975," by W. Beckerman and Associates, published by the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, London.)

There is no simple explanation for this contrast. Is it because British investment is going into the wrong places, or is being wastefully conducted by inefficient management? Or is it that the average performance of factory workers is lower than elsewhere on the same machines? It may be that all these accusations could be substantiated in part. But if it is true that the performance of the best British firms is well up to international standards, then one obvious remedy would be to encourage these firms to engage in violent competition, capture a much larger share of the market and so increase the death rate of the inefficient.

It must be understood, however, that competition in a full employment economy like Britain means, above all, competing with other employers for the extra labor which the efficient firms need in order to expand their output rapidly. The conclusion is, therefore, that greater mobility of labor requires that the successful firms should ignore the standard wages paid by their industry, and bid up the wage level way beyond anything that the average firm can afford.

But here British industry comes up against the pressure of the Government's "incomes policy." As part of the strategy for overcoming the balance of payments crisis which the Labor Government met when it came into office 22 months ago, George Brown, Labor's Deputy Prime Minister, was put in charge of a major effort to bully, persuade and cajole employers and trade unions to hold down wages and prices. The operation has been more successful on prices so far than on

wages. There is now an overpowering fear about the effect that any further big increase in wages would have on the balance of payments.

Thus, under the newly enacted six-month wage freeze, the individual employer who is efficient enough to pay more cannot step out of line and bid up the price of labor. This is one example of the way in which the imperatives of the immediate crisis run counter to the long-term needs of the British economy. What is required is plainly more flexibility on the part of management and more mobility of labor. But the actual means chosen to meet the crisis makes for inflexibility and more trouble in the long run.

The same conflict between the demand for short-term relief and the need for long-term change in the structure of British industry appears at a number of other points.

In order to right the balance of payments, the Government has embarked on a massive program of deflation involving, among other things, a sharp squeeze on personal and business credit. In consequence, the healthy rise in manufacturing investment which occurred in 1964-65 has been slowed down, and by the end of this year will go into reverse.

The immediate benefit to the balance of payments will no doubt be considerable. The import bill will be cut as business slows down; in particular, there will be a saving on imported plant and machinery which have lately accounted for as much as one-fifth of the value of all plant and machinery installed in Britain. But it is precisely such investment goods which are required to secure the competitive power of British industry in the long run.

Indeed, the treatment of the present balance of payments crisis by the British Government provides the clearest possible illustration of the sequence of causes which, repeated several times over since the war, have led to the chronic economic weakness of the mid-nineteen-sixties. Because of inadequate manufacturing capacity at home, a business boom in Britain quickly leads to an excessive rise in imports, which is followed by a balance of payments crisis. This is aggravated by special factors resulting from the exposed position of the pound sterling as an international currency. Those who normally keep balances in sterling in London begin to withdraw them. The currency reserve drops steeply, and in order to stave off a devaluation, various friendly countries, usually led by the United States, mount a short term loan.

The demonstration of international support is usually enough to stop the speculative attack on the currency. But then the Government feels obliged, partly so as to reinforce international confidence in its good intentions, to embark on a sharp deflation. That, in turn, leads to a cutback in fixed investment. So, in the end, the extra productive capacity which is needed to achieve a faster growth of output fails to get built.

Repeat this sequence a half dozen times—as it has been since the war—and you have an economy which is chronically under-equipped with the margin of extra capacity that would allow it to respond quickly and flexibly to new demands as they are made.

You also have a society in which a sense of collective penury makes for growing public skepticism about the ability of Britain to cope with any major international task. It is not that ordinary people feel impoverished in their daily lives or that there are any extra political strains nowadays in the handling of domestic problems, though there is, it is true, a widespread sense of frustration about the inadequacy of British social capital—roads, schools, hospitals, etc. But the familiar talent for improvisation, which has not by any means disappeared, takes some of the edge off the attendant hardships. For the rest, the vitality of British social, intellectual and artistic life, particularly among

the young, seems little affected by the unresolved economic crisis.

Where it is felt in the attitude toward any policy that involves British relations with foreign countries. It is, for example, all right—though only just all right—for Britain to accept the consequences of the economic boycott of a country as small as Rhodesia. But the operation, it is felt, must be conducted with the greatest circumspection. At all costs, the risk must not be taken of offending South Africa.

Yet the truth is that South Africa is a market for only 4 per cent of British exports, and the preferential treatment of South African products in the British market makes British goodwill more important to South Africa than the other way about.

The underlying attitude which is illustrated by the Rhodesia-South Africa case is not, however, simply a sense of inadequacy. Rather, there is a tendency to believe that Britain has allowed herself—in a kind of postimperial fit of absence of mind—to become excessively burdened with commitments abroad, and that it is this set of burdens which is chiefly responsible for the failure to overcome the long-drawn-out economic crisis at home. Hence, the increasing pressure for a withdrawal of British forces from positions in the Indian Ocean and the Far East.

There is a widespread suspicion that this military commitment is retained out of deference to the wishes of the United States, which needs a partner in the task of policing the area east of Suez. This, it is argued in some quarters, is the payoff in return for America's loyal support of the pound sterling.

Whether this conclusion is true or false, the mood behind it is one which is likely to express itself with growing insistence. Each foreign military commitment, whether it involves the Commonwealth or the United States, will be examined henceforth with a sharply critical and parsimonious eye. And so will the commitment to run an international currency through the machinery of the sterling area.

By now there is pretty clear evidence that the consensus in the upper reaches of the powerful British bureaucracy in Whitehall is in favor of ditching sterling as an international currency, if a convenient opportunity to do so should arise.

There is no evidence, however, that Prime Minister Wilson has any sympathy with the views of those who wish to retreat, either from the sterling area or from defense positions east of Suez. But he may find it difficult in the long run to stand out against the trend of opinion which has been developing steadily over the past two or three years, and which begins to look irresistible.

How far would a retreat of this kind provide the remedy for Britain's economic weakness? Making a simple calculation on the basis of the 1966 figures it is easy to show that a cessation of all military expenditure outside Western Europe, combined with the ending of the preferential treatment accorded to British exports of capital that go to the sterling area, would be enough to put the British balance of payments fully into the black—with a useful surplus to add to the country's gold reserve.

Of course, no quick relief of that kind is remotely possible. The arithmetic is only worth doing in order to isolate and identify clearly the special factors which have made the British balance of payments exceptionally weak by comparison with other West European countries for an exceptionally long time. These factors are related in one way or another to international responsibilities which Britain has accepted. Even those who are most irked by them today do not propose anything so irresponsible as a sudden and complete withdrawal from them

in 1966. The process is envisaged as a gradual one, lasting into the nineteen-seventies.

There is, besides, the opposing argument: It is absurd that the worldwide policies of a nation like Britain should be determined by a panicky anxiety to save a mere \$500 million or so of foreign exchange, which is what the total British military establishment outside the European Continent costs in foreign currency each year. The sum represents less than 1 per cent of the national income. But then the amount required to move the balance of payments from deficit into surplus is pretty small, too.

The problem is both marginal and fundamental. It is wrong to infer that just because an economist's calculation suggests that some quantity is small by comparison with another quantity, it is not going to require a major act of political will to shift it.

Among the economists in Britain there is a great debate currently in progress about the precise nature of the act of will which the problem requires.

One school of thought, which has strong support in the Treasury, still the most powerful department in Whitehall, is that the essential defect of the British economy is overemployment. Because there is no reserve of productive power, resources do not move to the places where economic opportunity beckons. At the same time, the bargaining power of labor, even of inefficient labor, is greatly enhanced. This factor, it is alleged, drives up wages and costs in an inflationary spiral. The conclusion, is that all would be well if Britain secured permanently a somewhat higher level of unemployment—specifically, a level which insured that there were more people looking for jobs at any one time than job vacancies available.

On the other side of the debate, it is pointed out that the most successful of Britain's European competitors have for several years now managed to live and expand very fast with an even lower level of unemployment than Britain. In Germany, for example, the number of registered job vacancies in relation to the number of unemployed is in the ratio of 5 to 1. The labor shortage does not prevent German output and exports from increasing at a rate which, despite a recent decline, is still the envy of the British. The evidence from the Continent has not, however, been found persuasive in London and in mid-July Wilson stepped in and resolved the debate firmly in favor of higher unemployment. The decision is unlikely to make any contribution whatsoever to the solution of the deeper problem.

When the British case is examined in depth, the main defects are seen to be in the structure of the economy itself, and to have been present for a long time past.

Certainly, the slow rate of growth compared with other industrial nations and the lower level of investment have been rather constant features, noticed by many observers since before World War I. More generally, there has been a tendency throughout all these years to neglect the sources of economic growth, notably the systematic training of managers and skilled workers.

It can be argued that throughout this century Britain has been so absorbed either by her imperial role or, later, by the process of unravelling the largest empire in history that the focus of her productive effort has been concentrated abroad rather than at home. The most able men went out to rule India or to look after the new ventures set up with British money in South America or in Africa; meanwhile, the country's own back garden was cultivated with too little energy.

If this analysis is correct, the deficiencies of social capital, the sense of crowding and physical inconvenience, are all part of the

same phenomenon which ends up with the chronic weakness of the British balance of payments that has emerged in the nineteen-sixties. There has been a tendency to treat the problems of overcrowding and inadequate amenities as if they were an inevitable aspect of life on a "tight little island." But in fact the surface area of the United Kingdom is the same, within 2 per cent, as the German Federal Republic's (including West Berlin).

If West Germany produces the impression of a society in which there is much more room for maneuver, in all senses of the term, it is very largely because of its long accumulation of social capital, not only in the obvious forms of roads and buildings, but also in the training of its ordinary citizens to achieve a high average level of industrial efficiency.

Here, once again, one is thrown back on the characteristic feature of the British way of life which I noted earlier in the field of industrial management—the wide spread between the excellence at the top and the performance of the average. Traditionally, the British have been successful in generating excellence but they have not shown much energy in the pursuit of mere competence. It is typical that the country produces many new industrial ideas but seems to be short of people who will proceed to the next stage and turn them quickly into productive and profitable investments.

When the matter is viewed in this historical perspective, the British economic problem of the sixties appears as part of a larger struggle to rid the country of a set of deeply rooted habits of mind and ways of doing things. Changes are now taking place. Indeed, the new approaches to the problems of training and of social equality that are a feature of the past five years or so mark an important departure. Surely, anyone who visits the country and takes time off to observe how the new generation behaves, at work as well as at leisure, will have the sense that something significant is on the move.

It would move a great deal faster if the physical environment—above all, the country's productive equipment—were being changed and renovated with the same energy. What this means is that Britain requires an extended period during which it will achieve a higher level of investment than that of its neighbors in Western Europe, instead of the lower level which has come to be accepted as part of the order of nature since the beginning of this century. Each time British investment has begun to move forward in a healthy and vigorous fashion, it has been halted in its tracks by a balance of payments crisis. The short-term imperative takes over—usually as part of some patriotic venture, like the current campaign to "save the £"—and the long-term consequences are forgotten.

It is arguable that the obsessive British sense of responsibility in international relations has been a source of weakness. Certainly French irresponsibility, which has pursued national economic self-interest regardless of the cost in devaluations of the currency and other inconveniences to France's neighbors, has paid big economic dividends. When France had a weak currency and an expanding economy in the nineteen-fifties she did not allow her domestic policy to be determined by the views of foreign bankers on how to improve the nation's credit rating.

That is what Britain has now done. The result which can now be infallibly predicted for 1967 is a repetition of the "stop-go" cycle that has again and again held back the growth of the country's productive power since the war. It is argued by some that the British Government had no option, that having incurred a huge short-term loan

amounting to \$3 billion from a group of friendly countries to see the pound sterling through the crisis of 1964-65, it had to squeeze everything in sight in order to repay the debt on the due date, which is 1970.

The truth is that what Britain needs at this stage in order to carry out the overdue adjustments in its economy is more, not less, room for maneuver. A wage freeze is the opposite of what is required to make labor more mobile; a still tighter credit squeeze will not induce British business to hurry up and re-equip. It is by no means certain that Britain's creditors would insist on quick repayment of the international loan given for the support of sterling if it were clear that the consequence was going to be a further weakening of Britain's long-term capacity for economic growth.

Indeed, if the problem were properly posed, and seen not as a question of how fast the British balance of payments can be brought into equilibrium but of providing the conditions for a shift in Britain's industrial structure, it would not be unreasonable to ask the creditor countries to contribute actively to a solution.

The first step would be to secure a longer period for British payments on the \$3-billion loan. Instead of trying to meet the commitment to pay it off between now and 1970, repayment should be postponed to 1970-74. On top of that, Britain should obtain an international loan, pledging some of her own still very large overseas investments as security against it, with the aim of achieving three or four years' respite from the pressure on the balance of payments. The money should be used deliberately to finance necessary purchases abroad and to provide extra currency reserves which would act as a shield against any external attack on the nation's finances.

The argument, in other words, is that Britain needs to organize a second "take-off" period, of the kind that Walt Rostow discussed in relation to underdeveloped countries. Britain was the first country in the world to take off into the industrial era in the 18th century. It is also the first case of a developed country that has reached the point where it needs to engineer another take-off—to a permanently higher level of investment.

INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS OCEAN ELECTRONICS SYMPOSIUM IN HONOLULU

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, Hawaii is honored to be host this week to delegates attending the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Ocean Electronics Symposium in Honolulu.

The State of Hawaii aspires to be a leader in the field of oceanography and we are naturally delighted that this conference will acquaint many more scientists and engineers with the natural advantages we possess in this exciting new field.

The Honorable Robert A. Frosch, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, was one of the distinguished speakers at the symposium. Since his comments come on the heels of enactment into law of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, I believe they will be of interest to my colleagues.

I therefore ask that Mr. Frosch's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT A. FROSCH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AT THE INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERS OCEAN ELECTRONICS SYMPOSIUM, HONOLULU, HAWAII, AUGUST 29, 1966

One of the pleasures afforded me by my appointment to the post of Assistant Secretary of the Navy and my subsequent appointment as chairman of the ICO has been the opportunity to regain my membership in the community of those who follow the sea, as engineers, as scientists, or as sailors. I had the opportunity this summer to spend some time at Woods Hole, one of the eastern bastions of Marine Science, and I am now delighted to be with you in Honolulu, the westernmost strong point of marine studies in the United States.

Hawaii has a long and distinguished position in the History of the U.S. Navy, and that tradition is being continued today in the headquarters of Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet, Commander Anti-Submarine Warfare Force Pacific, Commander Service Force Pacific, Commander Submarine Force Pacific, Commander Fleet Marine Force Pacific, and in the use of this magnificent island and harbor as a major Naval Base with its associated activities. The University of Hawaii, and the citizens of the state, have expressed their interest in becoming a major force in Marine Science and technology and have begun to build strong facilities and capabilities to do so. Set in the midst of the ocean, and enjoying close ties with the Navy, this is a natural development for Hawaii, and one that the Navy and the Federal Oceanographic community hope to encourage. The University is already involved in Navy and other Federally-sponsored marine research in tsunamis, currents, seismic, magnetics, gravity, and acoustics, principally by AEC, NSF and Navy.

There is no doubt that Honolulu and the island state of Hawaii will play an expanding role in the scientific and technological conquest of the sea.

It is customary in discussing oceanography to point out, first, its vital importance to our national defense, a fact which certainly cannot be exaggerated, and second, to catalog the fabulous wealth that lies in the sea—wealth in the form of minerals and chemicals that will soon be in short supply on land and wealth in the form of food and fresh water for an already protein-starved and water-starved world.

Because these facts are known to most of you here, I will not elaborate on them.

Instead I would like to take a few minutes to invite your attention to very recent developments which will have a profound and almost immediate effect on the whole field of oceanography, both military and non-military.

The first is the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 which President Johnson signed into law on the 17th of June.

We are fortunate in having in the Congress at this point in our history a number of perceptive congressmen who have taken the time to make a thorough study of oceanography and its importance to the national welfare. This law is the result of careful consideration and intelligent compromise on the part of these gentlemen.

Though the dollar expenditures will probably not be the same, this law will escalate the nation's oceanographic program to the same level of public interest and awareness as accrued to the space program from the National Space Act of 1958.

Oceanography is defined in many ways depending upon the individual discussing the subject. The law has adopted the broad view prevalent in Congress and in industry, that oceanography connotes far more than scientific study. In this law the term Marine Science is applied to oceanographic and scientific endeavors and discipline as well as engineering and technology in and with relation to the Marine environment (Marine environment including the oceans and the Great Lakes as well as their boundaries).

The law sets up a National Council on Marine Resource and Engineering Development to be headed by the Vice President of the United States and made up of cabinet members and agency heads with a major statutory interest in the field. I was privileged to attend the first meeting of this National Council less than two weeks ago.

It is certainly obvious to all of us who attended this first meeting that the Vice President has had a long standing personal interest in oceanography, and intends to devote whatever personal time is needed to carry out this aspect of his duties. I can assure you that this administration is taking the challenge of ocean exploration most seriously. Although the life of this national council is limited to a period of about 22 months, it has a statutory set of purposes "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long range national program in marine sciences for the benefit of mankind." It is the policy of this administration to use the council as a policy-making body—to expand scientific understanding of the oceans, to accelerate the development of marine resources and to establish an engineering capability to realize the full potential of the oceans in contributing to our national security and well being.

The Act requires the council to prepare an annual report of the National Oceanographic Program for the President to transmit to the Congress. The report will describe Federal multi-agency programs, evaluate these activities, and will set forth recommended funding for all participating agencies during the succeeding fiscal year.

This Council's other responsibilities are:

- To advise and assist the President in an annual review of Federal programs, surveys of such activities and steps to coordinate the activities of all agencies;
- To develop long range policy studies of the potential benefits of the oceans to the U.S. economy, security, health and welfare, including a study explicitly aimed at international legal problems;
- To evaluate and interpret the study report to be developed by the citizens' commission before it is transmitted to the President; and
- To coordinate a program of international cooperation in work pursuant to marine science activities.

Dr. Ed Wenk was appointed by the President as the new executive secretary to the council and was sworn in by the Vice President at the first national council meeting. He will be the Vice President's right hand man for matters under the jurisdiction of the national council. Dr. Wenk was formerly Chief of Congress' Science Policy Research Staff and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and before that Executive Secretary of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. He has made major personal contributions to the design and engineering of deep submersibles.

The law further empowers the President to appoint a commission on marine sciences, engineering, and resources to be composed of 15 members from industry, universities and marine laboratories as well as the federal and state governments. This citizens' commission is given up to 18 months to study

and to recommend to the President of the United States and Congress an overall plan for present and future needs. The President expects to announce appointments to this commission within the next few weeks.

As chairman of the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, I have been directed by Dr. Hornig, the President's Science Advisor and chairman of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, to cooperate in every manner with the national council.

In summary, we now have a national policy council on oceanography at the very highest level in government chaired by the Vice President of the United States. Under the umbrella of this council, the Interagency Committee on Oceanography will discharge its responsibilities and the staff of the ICO will completely support the work of the council. We hope that arrangements can be made so that the council can call on the citizens' commission, or its individual members and staff, as a group of experts in and out of government to act as advisers to this national council. Thus we will have everyone in the federal government engaged in oceanography pulling together under the policy direction of the Vice President to come up with recommendations to the President of the United States to carry out the statutory set of purposes under this new act.

Now, I don't want to second-guess the findings of a Commission that is yet to be appointed, and a policy council that has just met for the first time but I do think that a long shadow has been cast toward the future by the recent report of the Panel on Oceanography of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

The report is entitled "Effective Use of the Sea," and is available from the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office for 60 cents. You couldn't make a better investment—perhaps most of you have already made your investment. You don't have to agree with everything in it (and parenthetically, I have found no one who does) to realize that it is a significant report, which is going to affect the shape of things to come in oceanography.

The PSAC report defines oceanography as all "activities within the ocean that have significant scientific or technological content"—a definition in keeping with the broad popular meaning given to oceanography over the past few years.

The title "Effective Use of the Sea" comes from the recommendation that the national objective of our ocean program should be "effective use of the sea by man for all purposes currently considered for the terrestrial environment."

An attempt to answer the question "What is the proper role of the Federal government in oceanography?" is indicated by their statement that "division of effort among government, industry, and universities appropriate to land-based activities is advisable for the oceans and that the Federal Government should not preempt these activities to the extent it has, for example, in space."

Assigning highest priority to those efforts in oceanography that deal with national security, the report discusses the increasing need for the Navy to be prepared to defend the developing interest in all depths of the ocean, and to provide for the continuing projection of U.S. power on and under the oceans in an era of increasing sophistication in the use of the seas. This leads the report to recommend expansion of Navy capabilities which will permit operation anywhere within the oceans at any time. As you know, the Navy has underway a Deep Submergence Systems Project including Man-in-the-Sea. This report further asserts that this effort as presently constituted is insufficient if the Navy

is to meet its goals in a reasonable time period.

The report recommends assignment of federal program responsibilities for Man-in-the-Sea and undersea technology to the Navy. Thoughts and plans are relatively inexpensive. To put them into effect costs money. As the result of a recent study which proposed a plan for the Navy's future role in undersea technology, the Navy has included a new line item in the FY 1968 budget request, entitled "Deep Ocean Technology."

I fully support the Chief of Naval Operations (Admiral David McDonald), in his statement before Navy League that the Navy will require improved capabilities in its undersea strategic forces, anti-submarine warfare forces, as well as the ability to perform undersea search and recovery operations. Improvement of the Navy's capabilities in these areas depends largely on our national ability to discover and exploit new knowledge in ocean science and our success in developing new and relevant ocean technology.

We have seen a new horizon emerging, centering on our capability to engineer the oceans. We now face problems attendant upon our ability to explore the oceans, to exploit the oceans, and to occupy portions of the oceans' bottom.

I join the Secretary of the Navy, who for years has been convinced that the general area of ocean exploration and exploitation offers a challenge just as great as that posed by the current exploration of outer space, and that it will ultimately require a national effort on a comparable scale.

Our oceanographic programs are dramatic, they have captured the imagination of the public, foreign and domestic. To say the least, they are interesting, to you and to all engineers and scientists.

I urge you to keep informed on these programs and national developments in oceanography and to prepare to work with us on the important and fascinating problems in this exciting field. It should be clear that while the Navy will lead in ocean technology, it will really be a national effort, a corporate endeavor: science, industry, and the Navy.

In summary, the PSAC oceanography report recommends that the Nation's oceanographic activities be supported by the Navy "in discharging its mission of national security through its laboratories and industry and through the Office of Naval Research support of civilian institutions, as well as by its supporting role in the development of undersea technology and provision of national test facilities."

In the civilian sector the report deals at length with the role of oceanography in facilitating the underwater recovery of oil and minerals, in providing fish protein and technology for a protein-starved world and with many other subjects such as water pollution, conversion of salt water to fresh, the role of the oceans in world weather.

The specific recommendations assigned the highest priority in the civilian sector to its development of food resources and the development of the capability for environmental prediction. The development of coastal regions for recreation and commerce were assigned a very high priority and the development of a modern hydrographic survey technology was assigned a high priority.

The establishment of Marine Study Centers, marine wilderness preserves, deep sea and tropical laboratories and facilities for specialized marine studies, and a national center for collection, maintenance, and distribution of living marine organisms are recommended in the report.

Since oceanography has progressed rapidly and many clearly identifiable problems exist the report recommends a shift away from

broad ocean surveys to solutions of specific problems. The need for oceanographers to evolve some fairly elaborate measuring arrays, with limited regions heavily instrumented, led to the recommendation for a step-by-step buoy program.

In discussing oceanographic research the report recommends that oceanographic research ships be separately funded as a block, and be grouped generally into regional fleets of reasonable size.

The major organizational recommendation would combine the Environmental Sciences Services Administration, Geological Survey, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and oceanographic activities of the Coast Guard and the Bureau of Mines in a single agency. This new agency would support the national effort by management of environment and ocean resources and providing description and prediction services through a balanced program of direct participation and support of industry and universities.

At the request of the President, each federal agency is considering the recommendations contained in "Effective Use of the Sea." The ICO is now in the process of examining the implications of these recommendations and the Vice President regards the analysis of the PSAC report as one of his Council's priority assignments, and expects to utilize the next Council meeting for this purpose. In his charge to the Vice President, the President requested the National Marine Council to carefully study the many recommendations of the report and to consider these proposals in developing suggestions for the President for fiscal year 1968.

At this time I can speak only for the Navy. Budgets permitting, the Navy intends to follow its recommendations. In the field of oceanography we feel an obligation to the entire nation. Almost every bit of oceanographic information gathered is not only of use to the Navy, but also to others in the oceanographic community. For instance, the work we do on sonar can be used to develop methods for studying the migratory habits of fish.

It is obvious that while pursuing military objectives, the Navy has an obligation to the national interest in ocean technology. We would like to see Navy dollars do double duty in supporting the civilian sector. In addition, the Navy accepts the responsibility for helping to develop the national undersea technology needed for effective use of the sea in the military, economic, social, and political sense. This, again, must be a corporate venture: a science-industry-Navy team.

To be certain that the Navy's portion of the National Oceanographic Program budget is carefully and wisely invested, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations have completed taking another long, hard look at the entire Navy Oceanographic Program. They have thought in terms of a more centralized authority to give even a better focus to the entire Navy program in oceanography and related efforts.

The Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Paul Nitze, has recently taken an action that will not only strengthen the Navy's oceanographic program but increase the Navy's ability to cooperate with all other agencies involved in our national oceanographic effort.

Effective immediately, the Secretary has established a new Office of the Oceanographer of the Navy and invested it with the necessary expanded authority to provide centralized direction of all of the Navy's oceanographic activities.

The new office will be headed by Rear Admiral O. D. Waters, Jr., who has been serving in the more limited position previously designated as Oceanographer of the Navy and

also as Commander of the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office.

Since the Secretary's instruction is not long and since it is written in the plain English for which he is noted, I will quote it to you in its entirety:

"This instruction defines the Naval Oceanographic Program, establishes an Office of the Oceanographer of the Navy, and prescribes the mission of the Oceanographer of the Navy.

"The Naval Oceanographic Program encompasses that body of science, technology, engineering, operations, and the personnel and facilities associated with each, which is essential primarily to explore and to lay the basis for exploitation of the ocean and its boundaries for Naval applications to enhance security and support other national objectives.

"The mission of the Oceanographer of the Navy is to act as the Naval Oceanographic Program Director for the Chief of Naval Operations, under the policy direction of the Secretary of the Navy, through the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research and Development), and to exercise centralized authority, direction and control, including control of resources, in order to insure an integrated and effective Naval Oceanographic Program.

"In carrying out his assigned responsibilities, the Oceanographer of the Navy is authorized to issue directives, management plans, requirements, tasks, instructions, and to allocate resources for the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations.

"The Chief of Naval Research is assigned additional responsibility as Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Ocean Science.

"The Chief of Naval Material, with approval of CNO, has assigned the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Development) additional responsibility as Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Ocean Engineering and Development.

"With the approval of the CNO, the Oceanographer of the Navy will designate an Assistant Oceanographer of the Navy for Oceanographic Operations. Pending this designation, the relationships of the Oceanographer of the Navy and the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office remain as at present.

"The Oceanographer of the Navy shall budget, justify, and administer all funds allocated to the Naval Oceanographic Programs as required for implementation of the program; shall insure that adequate funds are budgeted by activities of the Navy Department for support of the program; and shall develop and maintain a comprehensive budget documented for presentation to higher executive authorities and Congressional Committees.

"All national facilities, centers, and missions of the National Oceanographic Program assigned to the Department of the Navy will be managed and administered by the Oceanographer of the Navy.

"The Office of the Oceanographer of the Navy is hereby established directly under the Chief of Naval Operations.

"The Oceanographer of the Navy, under the Chief of Naval Operations, shall command the Office of the Oceanographer of the Navy.

"The Chief of Naval Operations shall issue the necessary directives to implement the provisions of this Instruction."

That is the end of the Secretary's instruction. Its unequivocal language leaves no doubt that the Navy views its work in oceanography as a major portion of its effort to maintain the defense of the nation at sea, and that it is organizing its resources to make a major contribution to the national effort; a team effort among the academic community, industry, State and federal agencies sharing the responsibility to work together under the leadership of the President and Vice President of the United States.

NO ALTERNATIVE TO VICTORY IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Howard K. Smith, in his column published in the *Evening Star* for Monday, August 29, has simply stated why the United States must and will push on to achieve its objectives in Vietnam. There is no alternative.

There being no alternative, as Mr. Smith points out so well, the United States must adjust itself to the long, long haul. For this is not a victory to be won overnight, as we have learned.

Mr. President, as Howard K. Smith has written, this is really a nation-building effort disguised as a war. And our prospects for success are good. These observations should be widely spread, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, entitled "Price of U.S. Defeat in Vietnam," written by Howard K. Smith, be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

PRICE OF U.S. DEFEAT IN VIETNAM TOO COSTLY (By Howard K. Smith)

We shall win the war in Viet Nam—that is, attain our oft-stated objectives. We shall do so for the simple reason that there is no alternative.

If we should lose and withdraw, or negotiate an empty agreement, every little band of politicians unable to win by consent in Latin America would acquire itself a Cuban adviser and have a go at a "War of Liberation." In half the countries of the world, the topical amusement would be going downtown to wreck the American embassy. That nearly happened in the period before we began seriously resisting in Viet Nam. After we began resisting, Ben Bella, Nkrumah and Sukarno lost power in succession and our embassies became their prosaic selves once again.

Nothing as epic as a decline or collapse of American power in the world would result from failure in Viet Nam. Instead, in the next serious engagement—say, in Thailand—an overwrought American opinion would insist on victory at any price. We would put not 300,000 but 3 million troops into combat. Gen. Westmoreland's promising career would end with a desk in the Pentagon, and the most uncompromising hawk would be called in to "bomb" them back into the Stone Age. Our politics would once again be poisoned as at the time of McCarthy.

These things simply cannot be allowed to happen. So we shall have to straighten out the real facts about guerrilla war and win.

Guerrilla wars are won by one thing, and that is attrition. Two tough entities grate against one another until the tougher rubs the other to pieces.

The idea that the side closest to the common people wins is a romantic notion. In fact, the side that wins is almost always the side that gets the most abundant help from a nearby foreign power. In the Napoleonic wars, only a British invasion enabled the Spanish guerrillas to be successful. In World War II, no guerrilla movement had much chance until abundant Allied aid and an Allied invasion of Europe became real prospects. After that war, the Greek Communist guerrillas flowered while Tito provided a flood of support and a ready refuge. But when he shut the border, they withered.

Ho Chi Minh would never have won in North Viet Nam had not China gone Communist next to him. He could not fight now

but for a flood of help from outside: all his oil, all his trucks, all his aircraft and antiaircraft defense, and almost all his arms and ammunition come from other Communist nations. Though the fighting in South Viet Nam is not a simple invasion from the North, it could not last 12 months on a serious scale if North Viet Nam stopped sending men and material.

Well, the foreign country with power to make up for lack of proximity is the U.S. With our impressive native talent for improvisation—trying and failing until eventually we find the right way—we are making that power increasingly effective.

But it will take time and patience, which are not usually American virtues. We are adjusted to short-term results, to annual sessions of Congress, annual budgets and annual company reports. For this effort we have to adjust to the long, long haul.

We must learn to shrug off setbacks and disappointments, and even occasional disasters. The Communists have a 20-year head start in sinking their "infrastructure" into South Viet Nam, and we have only been seriously learning to root it out for about a year.

We shall have to keep in mind that our saturation reporting of our own problems, compared with a near blackout on information from the enemy, creates the false impression that only we have problems. In fact, what evidence there is suggests that the Communists' problems are much worse and are growing more so each month.

We need to keep clear the fact that this is really a job of nation-building disguised as a war. Despite the subtlety and difficulty of the mission the prospects are good. The people with whom we work are clever. Their country is rich and can grow anything in abundance. Both the Buddhist demonstrations of last summer, and the firmness with which order was restored, are tokens of a crystallizing nation.

The raw materials are right and so are we. We could possibly talk ourselves into defeat, and a fraction of our intellectuals are giving it a hard try. But probably they shall not succeed. The easiest path is success, and in our usual halting way, we are moving along that path.

RAYMOND C. DOBSON, GRAND EXALTED RULER OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 4 of this year at Dallas, Tex., a distinguished North Dakotan, Raymond C. Dobson, was elected grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

All North Dakotans are extremely proud of the honor bestowed upon Mr. Dobson and upon our State. Mr. Dobson, I know, will be an outstanding grand exalted ruler. He has been active in the affairs of the Elks for over 40 years.

Mr. President, the September issue of the Elks magazine contains a reprint of Grand Exalted Ruler Dobson's acceptance speech which I ask unanimous consent be inserted in the body of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* as a part of my remarks. Grand Exalted Ruler Dobson's remarks, while primarily directed to those in attendance at the grand lodge convention, I believe merit the thoughtful consideration of all citizens.

Mr. President, Grand Exalted Ruler Dobson is a distinguished journalist. He

serves as editor and publisher of the Minot Daily News, published in Minot, N. Dak., an excellent and very aggressive daily newspaper of which he and his associates are justly proud.

Appearing in the same issue of the Elks magazine is an editorial entitled "Leader From North Dakota" which I ask unanimous consent to also have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. The high opinion of the grand exalted ruler as expressed in this editorial is shared by all North Dakotans and people everywhere who have come to know him.

There being no objection, the speech and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF RAYMOND C. DOBSON
(Presented at the Grand Lodge Convention in Dallas following his election to office on July 4.)

Grand Exalted Ruler Bush, distinguished Past Grand Exalted Rulers, Grand Chaplain Msgr. Scott, officers and members of the Grand Lodge and my Brothers:

I sincerely thank you for the highest honor and recognition which can be bestowed on any member of this, the nation's greatest fraternal organization. I am indebted to you for the confidence shown in me, and I shall do my best in the coming year to justify the faith you have exhibited.

Please, at the outset pardon some personal references. This year, with this convention in Texas, has for me a special significance. It was 100 years ago on March 15, 1866, that one of my grandfathers was discharged from the Union Army at Brownsville, Texas. Believe it or not, as the late Mr. Ripley would have said, Grandfather was, after three years of Army service, a veteran at the ripe old age of 15 years.

I am grateful that permission was given my bride of 39 years to be present on this platform along with other relatives. They might not believe this could have happened to me, except for the fact they now are eyewitnesses.

You have been told I am a Protestant, Presbyterian, Mason and Shriner. My sponsor is a gentleman of Jewish descent. My nominator, as you know, is a Catholic gentleman of the cloth. No studied effort was made to have it this way—it just happened. And no where else except under the broad canopy of the brotherhood of the Elks would this take place.

Let's keep it that way! Always!

I sincerely thank Father Andrews for his kind words about me, and also Larry Moening from Owatonna, Minnesota, the state in which I was born, for coming here to make the seconding talk.

I am not certain, but after listening to them I suspect that both must have read what Mark Twain said about handling facts: distort them as the situation warrants.

It was the same Mark Twain who also wrote some words that I intend as Grand Exalted Ruler to live by: The higher we are placed, the more humbly we should walk.

I am thankful, too, to the good brothers of my home Lodge, Minot No. 1089, and all other Elks of North Dakota for their support; and likewise the Minot Elks Band and those cute youngsters, the majorettes, directed by Virginia Maupin.

I am the second man from North Dakota to be elected Grand Exalted Ruler. I am grateful to Past Grand Exalted Ruler Sam Stern, who despite illness came here to this convention to bear witness to the fact he is my sponsor. He and the other Past Grand Exalted Rulers who have been presented to you are dedicated and devoted Elks.

Someone has said that figures on occasions can be as dry as dust, but permit me to remind you of some facts always worthy of repetition. These distinguished gentlemen, the past Grand Exalted Rulers, have given a combined total of 264 years of their lives to leading and counseling the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks to the greatness it enjoys today. And this figure of 264 years does not include the years they spent in subordinate Lodge work, as well as in Grand Lodge, before assuming the responsibilities of leadership as Grand Exalted Ruler.

I suggest each of us think of himself as being a stockholder in a great corporation—the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. And further that we think of the past Grand Exalted Rulers as constituting its board of directors. I say with all emphasis that we, the stockholders, are indeed most fortunate.

Perhaps this best explains why the Elks, who only two years hence will observe a century of existence, are growing and prospering, and giving no evidence of hardening of the arteries.

The records show I will be the 90th man to occupy the office of Grand Exalted Ruler in 98 years. And if you wonder why only 90 men in 98 years have been Grand Exalted Ruler, it is explained by the fact that in earlier days on occasions the leader would serve more than one term.

I am very conscious of the fact that I am following on the heels of a man, Leonard Bush, who has endeared himself to our membership nationally, and has contributed in large measure to growth and progress in the year now ending. I congratulate him for his achievements, and only hope I can come close to filling his spacious shoes.

The program which I have in mind for the coming year will be laid before the District Deputy Grand Exalted Rulers and State Association Presidents Tuesday noon, and before the Exalted rulers of the subordinate Lodges on Wednesday, noon. I shall now only sketch what I have in mind.

On membership I ask for an increase of at least 10 percent of the total at the beginning of the Lodge year.

In community service, let every subordinate Lodge seek out in its community some worthy cause or project for the betterment of all its citizens, which the Elks should undertake and carry to conclusion.

In youth activities, let the good work continue and be broadened, and we in great bounty will be satisfied that we truly are doers of good.

Every subordinate lodge should recognize in a tangible way the sacrifices being made by good and loyal Americans who by their valor on distant battlefields are making more secure this land and our lives. Such recognitions can take many forms, and suggestions intended to be helpful will be passed along.

I ask that each subordinate Lodge write a new record of achievement in contributions to the Elks National Foundation based on a minimum gift of \$1.00 per membership, with an objective of topping \$1,500,000.

Continue the successful Elk-of-the-Year program, and in larger Lodges consider choosing an Elk-of-the-Month so that more men deserving of recognition will be honored.

Acquaint yourselves with the opportunities that exist for older members to enjoy the fall or winter time of their lives at the Elks National Home at Bedford, Virginia.

Bear in mind that there is a demarcation line between good fellowship and abuse of sound judgment in club operations.

Continue, as so many subordinate Lodges have in recent years, to improve, rehabilitate or construct new Elks homes.

Give enthusiastic support to, and expand, the Major Projects programs being carried on in greater numbers every year by state associations.

All subordinate Lodges should take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the Elks magazine to record your good deeds and other newsworthy activities.

Two years is not too far ahead for us to start learning about what we should expect of ourselves in the waning days of a century of existence. Obviously, we can't drive into the future looking all the time in a rear vision mirror. We have moved from a kerosene lamp and gas mantle era to the space age. We cannot deny, looking today at a vibrant Elks organization, that those who have made it possible possessed an enduring philosophy of life that has enriched our own lives.

I can see more light than darkness in the Elks future, and obviously that is what others have visualized in the past. But intelligent effort continues to be needed.

I like the story about an administrator in Africa who rode out to inspect land that had been devastated by a storm. He came to a place where giant cedars had been uprooted and destroyed. He said to the official in charge of forestry: "You will have to plant some cedars here."

The official replied: "It takes 2,000 years to grow cedars the size these were. They don't even bear cones until they are 50 years old."

"Then," said the administrator, "we must plant them at once."

The objective now—at once—of the Elks should be to move beyond old accomplishments, while perpetuating the memory of them; to build a good present and prepare for a better future.

Our year of service ahead is a new one, with no accomplishments or mistakes in it as yet. Like the birth of every new day, it is a reprieve granted by the governor of time to his subjects. We must not squander the legacy of any moment!

I am mindful that this eventful day in my life, made so by your kindness, also is the birthdate of this nation—a nation in which run the bloodlines of many peoples.

It disturbs me, as I am sure it also does you, to look out upon this nation on its 190th anniversary. World peace hangs in precarious balance. Our enemies are unrelenting. They would destroy that birth certificate dated July 4, 1776.

We live with an awesome knowledge that what we choose to call one world might easily be triggered into a smoking, burning shambles of no world. And yet, sadly, the behavior of too many of our citizens gives evidence they don't appreciate that America is a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

I concede to all men the precious right of dissent. But I am much more impressed when it is tempered with common sense.

We see all too many misled and ill-informed citizens wasting their time in quixotic fashion, jousting with the windmills of absurdity. Good citizenship, such as we the Elks revere, is something more than a couple of cheers at a patriotic gathering. Democracy is something learned, not bestowed or legalized or seized. It demands of us, as Elks, participation, involvement, and contribution.

I say no, emphatically no, we're not going to be seduced by specious pleas into casting away what has been given us in this nation as an inheritance richer than pieces of gold. Those who would mislead us have no hammer for building but only a torch for destruction. It is not difficult to believe they were born with warped minds and never have nor never will gain a true sense of direction.

They are the type of whom that grand old warrior, Winston Churchill, was thinking when he so eloquently said: "Very often the eagles have been squalled down by the parrots."

I apologize to no one for my emotions when a lump comes to my throat as the flag passes by, and I place my hand over my heart. And did you ever notice, when you do that, that Old Glory waves back at you in appreciation?

Our Americanism program in the Elks must have greater emphasis in the year ahead.

A Good Elk is a volunteer—he needs no draft card to compel him to enroll in hard work and thought as we strive for what we know is best.

I intend to do my part.

I ask the same of you, my Brother Elks.

I always have looked upon my Elks membership card as a Distinguished Service Emblem because it enables each man who possesses one to be a participant in benevolence, something that had virtue when this Order was founded and has equal value today. It is something that will abide through all time.

We, by our interest in fellow human beings, have created an enviable image of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks to which all America bears witness. It serves as an asset to our Order in attracting new and desirable men to go before our altar and take the obligation. The future is ours with a responsibility to uplift this image in reverential respect.

I give you as a slogan for the coming year: Be Enthusiastic! Live and Help Live!

And as Elks let us live by these words: Closer America! Closer all peoples! Closer to our hearts and ideals. Closer to a world free of greed and suspicion. Closer! Closer in all of these things, by moving closer in fraternity to each other.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer for the year ahead. And I want your helping hands to insure for all Elksdom in 1966-67 a new grandeur and the best kind of life and happiness.

[From the Elks Magazine]

LEADER FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The man whom the delegates to the Grand Lodge Convention in Dallas last July chose to serve as Grand Exalted Ruler is accustomed to leadership both in Elksdom and in his profession. Raymond C. Dobson of Minot, N. Dak., Lodge No. 1089 became an Elk at approximately the same time that he started to work as a newspaperman, and in both careers he has compiled a distinguished record.

He became a cub reporter for the Minot Daily News when he was 19 years old and joined the Minot Elks Lodge as soon thereafter as he could, which was when he was 21. Today, as he has been for several years, he is editor and publisher of his newspaper, one of the country's best smaller dailies, and now chief executive of the fraternity to which he has devoted so much of his time, energy, and talents since he took the obligation in 1923.

Brother Dobson is the second North Dakotan to serve as Grand Exalted Ruler, the first having been Sam Stern of Fargo Lodge No. 260. This is a remarkable tribute to the caliber of Elksdom in North Dakota, when it is remembered that the 11 lodges have a total membership of 20,118.

It is worth noting that of the 11 North Dakota Lodges, 3 have a membership in excess of 3,000, there being only 25 lodges in the whole Order in that classification. In fact 8 of the 11 North Dakota lodges have a membership in excess of 1,000, and this in a state with a total population of less than 650,000. The state showed a membership gain this past year of nearly 8 percent against something under 2 percent for the Order. North Dakota Elksdom is in a very healthy condition, indeed.

Brother Dobson is not the first newspaper editor to head the Order of Elks. He is, in fact, the sixth. His predecessors were Howard R. Davis, who served in 1951-52, Charles E. Broughton, 1946-47, Robert W. Brown, 1905-06, Edwin A. Perry, 1883-84, and Thomas E. Garrett, 1880-82. There have been others whose careers included journalistic experience, among them Fred L. Bohn, 1956-57, Robert S. Barrett, 1944-45 and Floyd E. Thompson, 1932-33.

Elksdom's new leader is a man with a ready wit and high good humor. He also is capable of speaking bluntly and forcefully. How true it is, as he so clearly put it in his acceptance speech, that "Democracy is something learned, not bestowed or legalized or seized. It demands of us, as Elks, participation, involvement, and contribution."

Thoroughly seasoned in Elksdom and abundantly endowed by nature with the qualities of leadership, Brother Dobson also brings to his high office a personal commitment to the ideals and programs of this Order that is inspiring and refreshing. We look forward confidently to another year of achievement under North Dakota's Ray Dobson.

A NEWSMAN REPORTS FROM VIETNAM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the most lively and understandable report I have heard on the Vietnam conflict recently came from Jim Lucas, Pulitzer prize-winning Scripps-Howard war correspondent and an Oklahoman.

Jim was born at Checotah, Okla., attended the University of Missouri, and worked on Muskogee and Tulsa newspapers before he joined the Marines in 1942. He was a combat correspondent covering battles at Tarawa, Guadalcanal, New Georgia, Russell Islands, Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima. His war activity brought both a Bronze Star and the National Headliners Award for best combat reporting.

Scripps-Howard has been sending him over the world ever since, and his news reports have won one prize after another—George Polk Memorial Award, two Ernie Pyle awards, the Omar Bradley Gold Medal, Korean National Medal, the Pulitzer Prize and awards of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, and the American Legion. He has two books to his credit and this month is introducing a new one, "Dateline: Vietnam."

Because I think Jim has something to say to all of us, I have had transcribed a recording of his speech at the National Press Club August 18, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the transcription was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATeline: VIETNAM

(By Jim Lucas, National Press Club, August 18)

I guess maybe we ought to start by defining some of our terms and one of the questions I've been asked on a few of the TV and radio programs I've been on (and I've been selling books for the last ten days) is, "Are you a dove or a hawk?" I guess I'd have to say I'm a hawk as I understand the term.

If it's a hawk to believe as I believe, that what we're doing out there is just and honorable and fair and something that has to be

done—I'm a hawk. If it's to be a hawk to want to do whatever it takes to bring this thing to a successful conclusion and soon, I'm a hawk. If to be a hawk is to be bereft of compassion, to be unable to cry anymore, then I'm not a hawk. Maybe I'd say I'm a gentle hawk, if there is such a thing. I guess there is such a thing, because I know there is such a thing as a belligerent dove. I've seen some of those. Maybe I don't understand the term, because I think there is a third category we ought to introduce in here and we'll discuss them later, and that's the ostrich. He's also very much involved in this operation that we've got going out in Vietnam. So let's assume that I'm a hawk.

ALLIES WINNING—BUT TOO SLOWLY

Now the big question, of course, is how we're doing out there. I've found a great deal of discouragement since I've come home. Don Cosgrove was telling me as we sat here having lunch about a very distinguished military man who is not here today. He said, "I've heard all I want on Vietnam, I'm confused enough." I have found a great deal of confusion and disarray and this disturbs me, because to me, and I may be too close to the forest to see the trees, to me the issues of this thing are crystal clear.

How are we doing? I'm not discouraged. I hope I'm not a "Pollyanna." We're no longer losing. In the Delta, where George has been until recently, we have been consistently winning our war, and I believe we still are. In the central highlands around Pleiku where the VC not too long ago hoped—and had every reason to expect—they could cut Vietnam in two at the narrow waist, their ambitions there are no longer attainable, and they cannot be realized. Their goal to seize a capitol, a provincial capitol, and make it their rump capitol on Vietnamese soil; that's out of the question.

They're being hurt; they're being hurt very, very badly. We're no longer losing—we're a great deal more than just not losing. We're not winning as fast, however, as I'd like us to do and there is that extra effort that would enable us to. I hope we will, because this is a very serious struggle we're engaged in out there. It's very serious certainly to the men who are fighting it.

"WE HAVE TAKEN THE NIGHT AWAY"

Now up north, and I've spent the past eight months with my Marines (and I'm an ex-Marine) up in the First Corps area, things look a lot better. We've taken the night away from them. And this is something that they find just inconceivable. They have always owned the night. When they helped the French in the War of the Viet Minh, the night was theirs. As soon as it got dark, the French retired to their little Beau Geste forts and stayed there until dawn came and the countryside belonged to the Viet Minh—they could do with it as they chose and this is when they operated. And initially—we got into this thing gradually, telling ourselves for a long time we weren't even there—initially they also owned the night, but now it's not theirs.

In the First Corps, the Marine area, we set a thousand ambushes and run five hundred patrols in a single night. We're out as much as they are and they know even when they're out they don't have that sense of freedom, of license, that they used to have. We've taken the night away from them and they tend increasingly, now, to stay in their forts and their caves and their holes at night because those damn Marines—you can't trust them. And to them, this is inconceivable. It's not cricket. It's not playing the game by the rules that they've always played it by. We've taken the night away from them, which I think is a tremendous reversal of the tide of war in that part of the world.

GUERRILLAS' BACKS BROKEN IN DA NANG AREA

We've broken the backs of the guerrillas in the Da Nang area and the guerrilla represents a tremendous investment to these people. It takes at least sixteen and sometimes as many as twenty and twenty-one years to train a guerrilla. He's a local boy; he's the tax collector; he's the propaganda agent; he's the enforcer; he's the assassin; he's the guy that disembowels the friendly province chief or the district chief, and when you kill one of those guys, this isn't just shooting a soldier, you've taken a tremendous investment in time and training and resources away from the Viet Cong. And in Da Nang, General Walt told me just before I came home, we have killed 2,500 guerrillas in less than a year. So much so that they're trying to replace these characters with guerrilla experts from the north.

The guy from the north, he's not a local boy, he doesn't know the area any better than we do. He doesn't know it as well as we do because we've been there longer. We have found the bodies of North Vietnamese guerrilla experts two and three days after they were killed—still where they fell. He has no friends there. This wouldn't happen to a local boy, a local guerrilla. His family would come get him and bury him. But these are strangers so they stay there.

MEN FROM NORTH STRANGERS

They're so disoriented, some of them (North Vietnamese), that they have actually wandered into our lines because they don't know where they are. This is how hard-put they are to replace their guerrillas in that part of the world.

Again, I don't want to be a "Pollyanna." But things are going very well for us in the military sense. I'm not kidding myself that there is going to be a military solution to this thing. If this were a war that we could, as we did in World War II, sweep in off the beaches and clear everything ahead of us, sure we could do it.

We're trying to fight a war in the midst of a civilian population which is essentially friendly and do this with a minimum of dislocation to the civilians and their economy. We don't always accomplish this but the incidents that do occur are reasonably rare. You can't avoid them all. But our people are under blanket instructions, instructions that actually endanger our lives and which have cost us lives, to avoid as much as possible the endangering of a friendly people.

This is a strange war we're fighting there. I suppose any war you're in is the worst one because it is the one you're in. This is altogether different from World War II, altogether different from Korea where initially we did have this fluidity where there were no lines but which eventually settled itself down to more or less a conventional warfare.

JUNGLE MAKES FOR STRANGE WAR

Even when we've had a big operation as we did in Operation Hastings (and this was the last I was involved in before I came home), a big operation involving division-sized forces, you're still fighting small wars. Hastings was fought under one man, General English, but still fought in at least three separate pockets because you're fighting in jungle.

Even in Saigon they don't understand the jungle. They say go up in the mountains and get those people. Yes, go up there and get them. You ought to see that terrain. You can't see three feet on either side of you. You have to fight where you are and there is often no communication—physical communication—although there's always radio communication between units.

This is a very difficult war we're fighting. We're fighting it in the midst of a civilian population, a friendly population, trying to do as little damage to them as we can and we're fighting it often in the most impossible terrain.

MORE MANPOWER URGED

I'm convinced that with the infusion of more manpower, and I hope to God we get it (I think we will) we can bring those enclaves we hold, I'm speaking now essentially in terms of the First Corps area because this is where I've been for seven or eight months, we can bring Chu Lai, Da Nang, and Phu Bai together and make one big enclave.

We can even extend by bringing in more Army manpower down to Nha Trang and Qui Nhon and eventually we can push these people out of the Coastal Plains.

We can make Vietnam a viable nation economically and politically. We can push these people back into the mountains and let them have the highlands. Who cares? They can't live up there. They can't grow anything up there. Eventually they are going to have to come down for food and for medicine. And every time they do, we're going to clobber them.

They're hurting, and they're hurting badly. If these were a rational people, they would have recognized long ago that they cannot do what they set out to do.

If they were Russians, you know the history of the Russians, they put the pressure on in a half dozen spots throughout the past twenty years and when they found that they weren't going to push through, they weren't going to get what they set out to do, they were pragmatists, realists enough that they pulled back and pushed somewhere else.

ENEMY REQUIRES MORE CONVINCING

But these people are going to take a lot more convincing apparently than Russians or even Chinese. They know very little about the world in which they live and I think this is right, Mr. Ambassador, that they are mesmerized, hypnotized by Dien Bien Phu.

To them history begins and ends with Dien Bien Phu. That's where they whipped the French and they can do it again. Well, there ain't going to be another Dien Bien Phu. But they don't know that yet and they're going to take a lot more convincing.

It could conceivably be, and I think I said this the last time I was here, that there will be no formal end to this war anymore than there was a formal beginning. This war, like Topsy, just "grows." All of a sudden there it was and we had a full-scale war on our hands.

WAR MAY WITHER ON VINE

It may very well be that as these people are hurt and hurt badly, that they'll pull back into the hills and eventually this war will just wither on the vine and sort of peter out to an unsuccessful and inconclusive conclusion. That's not much to look forward to, but realistically, I think it's something to keep in mind.

Another question of considerable moment to our people back here is, "What about our men out there?" Well, like a lot of old folks my age, I have sometimes tended to become discouraged about the younger generation. Actually I think the only thing wrong with it is that I'm no longer a part of it. But I often thought that it was going to "hell in a wheelbarrow"—that it was hopeless. I know you probably tend to feel that way back here, particularly when you see some of the antics and the gyrations of the lunatic fringe of the younger generation, but it's been heartening to me to see these kids in action.

CITY BOYS "OWN" THE JUNGLE

These lads of ours, city boys, or boys from modern farms that even have TV and radio and electric lights, which they didn't have on farms when I was a kid, these kids have taken the jungle and made it their own—they own the jungle. I couldn't believe this happened but they don't like it; nobody likes it. There are snakes out there and this just scares the daylight out of me.

Our boys take this jungle and use it—they exploit it. It's a tool and a lot of these boys would rather fight in the jungle than out in the open because they know the jungle—they know what to do with it.

And they're much more at home in it than the North Vietnamese who are, to some extent, city boys too. They don't like the jungle, but our kids do.

I like being with troops. They are a wholesome bunch of young men. They rise to the occasion. Not all of them—we're dealing with human beings, but I think there is a challenge in it that these kids instinctively respond to.

When we first went out there, the North Vietnamese were accustomed to opening fire, ambushing and having the people being ambushed stalked. And we captured documents, which are very expressive, of their amazement when our boys charge—they just go at 'em. They're doing a whale of a job.

OUR BOYS WELL TRAINED

They are better trained than any soldiers we have ever sent into combat. This applies to the Army as well as the Marine Corps. They are better trained. They are every bit as good as my generation was and twice as smart.

They have weapons that I wouldn't begin to understand if they were explained to me every day, seven days a week, for six months at a time. I still wouldn't know what they were talking about. These kids are able to use them and use them well. Their morale is good, even when they take casualties, and that's the hardest part of it, of course. They go on fighting.

Howard K. Smith, I'm sure you know the story of his boy. Howard says, "He's 21 going on 50." And this is true of a lot of those youngsters out there.

I just want to bring back a report to you that they are doing a whale of a job and as long as this country can produce young men like that—men who rise to the occasion—who are capable of (for want of a better word) the heroics that these youngsters are, I don't think we have to worry too much about what lies ahead for us because the future of this country is in their hands and it's in good hands!

ENEMY WELL ARMED AND EQUIPPED

Now about the enemy. I'm not going to talk too long, I always say. I always do after I say it. I want to leave some time for questions. But what about the enemy? Well, he's good too. He's coming down across the parallel, down Ho Chi Minh Trail at the rate of 7,000 to 10,000 a month. He's coming down in division size. He's well armed. There are about 283,000 of them, I think, now south of the border. He's got considerable stockpiles built up over the years south of the parallel.

I don't know how it is in the Delta. I assume we're still fighting the VC down there—but up in 1st Corps, in many areas, the VC has virtually disappeared as a fighting force—it is now a locked-on engagement between the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese and the Americans on the other side.

He's well armed. He's well equipped. But he's hungry in many cases. We have systematically—and this may appall some people—but as part of war we have systematically gone for his rice caches, his supplies, and he's hungry.

ENEMY HUNGRY, MISINFORMED

He lacks medicine and he is giving up in surprising numbers. Even his officers are coming in with their weapons. I don't want to over-emphasize that because he's still a very good fighting force. But he has got his problems. He is terrified of those weapons of ours which he does not have—our artillery and our air power, and our mobility, our helicopters.

He dares not light fires at night. He is afraid often to cook his rice—too often for his own comfort, I guess you would say. He has to live off of berries and that sort of thing.

He has been surprised to find since coming south that he's been lied to. He was told when he left Nam Dinh or Vinh or wherever he started out from that the people of the south were oppressed—living under a dictatorship—prepared immediately to welcome him as a liberator and the fall of the south was just a matter of days and he would be in on the kill.

But he finds that there's no such welcome waiting for him—that in all too many cases the people of the south don't want him around, that they know he spells trouble, bad trouble, and they inform on him. Now a year ago it would have been worth a farmer's life to be seen talking to an American or a government trooper. This isn't true today. Our intelligence has improved considerably.

INFORMERS HELP UNITED STATES

On Operation Hastings we knew when they started bringing that division across the parallel. We watched them. We let them get about 75% of their men and supplies across. That 25%, though, that they didn't get across was what they really needed and then we hit them. We couldn't have done that without the cooperation of a lot of people who kept us informed as to what was going on in that area.

The North Vietnamese are hungry, they're desperately hungry for a showcase victory. Perhaps if they got that victory—another Dien Bien Phu—they'd be willing to come to the conference table on their terms. They may have to come without it, because every time they start massing for one of these big pushes, we know it well enough in advance that we hit them before they're ready.

We got them in An Loc the other day again, and they had to go back across the border into Cambodia and if anybody tells you they are not using Cambodia as a sanctuary, I think Sgt. Mjr. Woolridge and I are positioned to say we know damned well they are because we've seen them coming both ways!

NOT DESPERATE ENOUGH TO GIVE UP

Not too long ago (Colonel Barton remembers this) we had a young officer down on the Delta, Capt. Towry from Georgetown, South Carolina. The last time we saw him, he had run out of ammunition. He was being pulled across the river, the Kai Kai River, into Cambodia with his hands in the air. Two days later we found his body back in South Vietnam by about 100 yards, he had been killed over there and thrown back.

I'm not at all impressed with correspondents who go over and take bushes behind which no VC is hiding and say this proves there are no VCs over there. But we clobber these people every time they begin to mass, and they're getting pretty desperate. But they're not desperate enough to give up and they're not desperate enough certainly for us to let our guard down, because they are a very significant fighting force.

They are well armed. They are well trained, and there's that hard-core fanatic in them that is not going to give up, regardless of what you do to him. Fortunately, and again this sounds awful bloodthirsty (and maybe I am, I don't know) that hard-core being fanatic is the bunch that always fights to the death so they're the ones that are being killed off at a faster rate than anybody else.

It's the fringe echelon and they go through several gradations of Viet Cong or Commie, that is most willing to give up. I don't know how it is now, George, but when I left down in the Delta we were accepting the

surrender of an average of about a company of VC a month. And this is probably still true today. We brought about 400,000 people back under government control down there and the Delta looks mighty good.

SOUTH VIETNAM FORCES STILL IMPROVE

Finally, there is a question of what about the South Vietnamese. Well, I told you the last time I was here that they were a better fighting force then than when I went out in 1964. I can tell you that they are still improving. There are some mighty good units in the South Vietnamese army.

They need, above all, leadership. Leadership is not a commodity you produce over night. They are getting good leadership. The ranger battalions are as good, I'd say, as the U.S. Marines, almost anyhow, and that's about as high as I could go. The Vietnamese marines are top-flight. The paratroopers are good.

There are weak units. But the surprising thing to me is not that these people make mistakes—that they have weaknesses after being a nation so short a time under such adverse conditions. The interesting thing to me is that they keep trying—and they do try. You knock them down and they still get up again.

These people, and again I'm repeating what I said last time but it's still valid, these people are trying to do in one generation what we have done in this country in four or five.

MUST BUILD NATION, FIGHT TOO

They are trying to build a nation while fighting for their very existence. Either job would be a tremendous undertaking and they're trying to do both at once. The French left them nothing. They even, as I remember, took the light fixtures and the plumbing out of the National Palace when they left.

There are many Vietnamese, particularly in the rural areas, who simply want to be left alone. They are tired of war after twenty years. They want to be left alone to raise their rice and their children. They want to pay taxes to one side. And they will go with whichever side offers security and peace and increasingly it is our side that offers security and peace.

But there are enough Vietnamese (for want of a better word again) intellectuals who have the dream, who know what they want to do with and for their country to make this effort of ours worthwhile.

One of the questions I'm asked is, "Do the Vietnamese really want us there?" The answer to that has to be, "All things equal, no." We brought inflation. It's very hard for an Army officer or a civil servant or a person on a fixed salary to exist in Vietnam today because bringing in this influx of money and men, sure, we've caused inflation. And we have, to some extent, corrupted their youth.

MEN SHOW RESTRAINT

It's not surprising when you bring 300,000 healthy, young males in a country that has as many beautiful women as Vietnam has, that there is some fraternizing, and there is. We haven't corrupted them as much as we have a right to expect, really. Our men have shown considerable restraint and I give a lot of credit to General Westmoreland who does nothing but preach on this subject most of the time and whose preachings have gone home.

There is one magazine out there in English called "Vietnam Today" which actually complains that our men are too well behaved, that they don't think it's quite natural and they wish they'd let their hair down more. I don't know that this is quite true, but we have—we have upset things. And there's a clash in our culture.

The Vietnamese are a very proud people and they were a nation before we were

thought of. And they're proud of being Vietnamese. Their literature and their history mean a great deal to them and they would rather we weren't there.

UNITED STATES STILL WANTED

I only talk to that small fraction of Vietnamese who speak English—I don't speak any Vietnamese. So admittedly my contacts are very restricted. But you'll sit down with one of them and they enumerate their complaints and they're frank with you.

You agree that these complaints are just and well-taken and then you say "Well, O.K., what do you want us to do? Leave?" Oh, my God no. Not until this thing is won. Not until we have a nation. Not until the enemy is away and no longer among us. And this is precisely what we want to do. This is why we're there.

I have no apologies to make for what we're doing in Vietnam. We are in Vietnam, and let's be fair with ourselves and with everybody, because our interests are engaged there. We're not there because we're fine fellows, really. We sometimes say that, but I don't think even we are fooled.

We're there because the interests of the free world, which we head, are engaged in Vietnam. But we are incidentally doing a very fine thing for a fine bunch of people who deserve a lot better break than they've gotten from history.

ALTERNATIVES IMMORAL

I'm not the least bit on the defensive about what we're doing in Vietnam. There's nothing immoral about what we're doing there and I have yet to hear any alternatives suggested which aren't immoral.

What are we going to do? Are we going to pull out and abandon the Catholics, the Cao-Dai, the Hoa-Hao, the five-hundred thousand men and their families and the army of South Vietnam, the civil servants, the intellectual communities, the Buddhists (a lot of the Buddhists are completely loyal), are we going to abandon these people who have voluntarily cast their lot with the West and with freedom?

I think the answer to that has to be "No." We can't afford to because we've got to live with ourselves. I've heard it suggested, "Why don't we pull back to the Philippines and make our stand there?" Do you think the Filipinos would ask us? Think they'd let us? Think they'd want us?

They would say, "Look, Buster, when we saw what you did to these little people, the Vietnamese, we know what your word means. We've got to live out here because, geographically, here's where we're anchored. But we'll make them deal with the only power that exists out here, Communist China, and you go back to Hawaii or San Francisco and start digging your trenches and dig them deep because sure as shooting they're coming over after you."

WHAT ABOUT YOU BACK HERE?

Any argument about whether we should or should not be in Vietnam now is academic. We're there. This thing can be brought to a successful conclusion.

We have got to give it that extra effort, and this brings me to a question I want to ask you all and then I'll shut up. What about you all back here? I'm not at all sure since I came home that this country still has what it takes to see this thing through.

I have been shocked and appalled since I came home to find that one of the things we're proudest of back here is that we're able to wage this kind of a war in which a hundred to a hundred-fifty fine young Americans are killed each week, every seven days, without dislocating the civilian economy.

Well, what's so damned wonderful about that? In my books, a civilian economy ought to be dislocated. This is a war in which apparently the only people to be disaccommodated are the youngsters who are

dying. They're willing to put their lives on the line.

I have heard no valid reasons suggested back here for not backing them up—except that we're tired—we're weary—and we don't understand it.

THIS IS A SHOWDOWN—FREEDOM OR SLAVERY

The issues to me are crystal clear. This is a showdown, maybe not in the right place at the right time, but it's still a showdown between our side and theirs—between freedom and slavery, Democracy and Communism.

Sure we make mistakes and and we show our mistakes on the front page. They make mistakes and nobody ever knows about it. Our mistakes we can correct. The Commies' are set in concrete.

I believe we're going to see this thing through. I hope we do, so we can continue to be proud to be Americans, but it may be that we don't and if we don't, they can take it. They can have this world and they will take it, and make it their kind of a world. I said this the last time and I'll say it again. If the Commies take it and if they make it their kind of a world, they can have it because I wouldn't want to live in it.

Thank you.

IS SPACE PROGRAM MORE IMPORTANT THAN OUR CHILDREN'S NOURISHMENT?

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, this year the administration's budget contained over \$1,200 million for Apollo spacecraft to be used in our moon program. This would merely cover the heavy development test and production activity for space modules in preparation for manned development flights on the Saturn 1B early next year and on the Saturn V a year later.

Yet this amount of money could permit \$120 million a year to be spent on the special milk program for 10 years. Today the program is being short-changed. It received only \$100 million in fiscal 1966. This has been increased to \$104 million by Congress for fiscal 1967 but even more is essential if we are to adequately provide for the needs of the Nation's schoolchildren. A minimum of \$110 million should be appropriated for fiscal 1967 simply to allow a Federal reimbursement rate under the program comparable to the rate provided in past years.

I intend to fight for such a \$6 million increase as supplemental appropriations legislation comes before the Senate. We must not be so hypnotized by the stars that we forget to take care of the problems our Nation faces here on the planet earth.

I do not oppose the space program on the Apollo moon shot. This year I introduced amendments to reduce some of the marginal programs sponsored by the space agency by cutting its spending back by a half a billion dollars.

Nevertheless, a comparison of the cost of the school milk program with one limited part of the space program puts the cost of this great health and nutrition effort in perspective.

A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, on Monday a signal tribute was

paid to our beloved colleague and friend from Virginia, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, in recognition of his long and distinguished career as a Member of the Senate and the other body.

A group of his fellow Virginians, headed by Lt. Robert H. Guy, of Lynchburg, presented the Senator with an honorary life membership in the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe. The society is a patriotic, nonpartisan group of citizens founded by members of the American Legion and dedicated to the preservation of liberty as envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

The name of the Society of the Golden Horseshoe is derived from a significant event in the early development of colonial America, the discovery of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia by Gov. Alexander Spotswood.

Accompanied by a small group of friends, Governor Spotswood in 1716 made an arduous trip from his home, "Germanna," on the banks of the Rapidan River to the Blue Ridge Mountains. The objective of the journey was to explore the area west of the mountains and to establish forts to protect the frontier from an anticipated invasion by the French and hostile Indians. September 1 will mark the 250th anniversary of Governor Spotswood's discovery of the beautiful Valley of the Shenandoah which lies between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghenies.

Upon his return to Williamsburg, Governor Spotswood established an order called the Knights of the Golden Horseshoe and presented a Golden Horseshoe to each member of the party who made the trek to the Shenandoah. Today, the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe continues the tradition established by Governor Spotswood and presents those it honors with a horseshoe as an emblem of membership. Accordingly, the Senator from Virginia received the symbolic horseshoe when he was made an honorary member on Monday.

Mr. President, I know that every Member of the Senate joins me in extending congratulations to the Senator from Virginia on this honor. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement by Lieutenant Guy on the presentation to Senator ROBERTSON.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have assembled here this afternoon, not only to award a distinguished Life Membership Card, and the unique emblem of the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe, but also to pay tribute to a staunch Virginia Statesman, and a great American patriot, who has served his great state and nation with unusual honor and distinction in both Houses of the United States Congress for more than a third of a century.

Senator ROBERTSON was elected to his seat in the House of Representatives in 1933, facing one of the most critical economic crises this nation has endured. During those critical depression years, and until the present day, Senator ROBERTSON has never faltered in assuming the responsibilities of his office as they arose, nor has he tried to escape any task.

Many of us who have followed his Congressional career, recognize restraint, honesty of purpose, integrity, ingenuity and courage as his inherent characteristics. These assets have contributed much to his influence among his colleagues as well as to his numerous achievements during his long and colorful political career.

I would like to remind the Honorable Senator from Virginia that we recognize among his many admirable traits, that he exercises implicit faith in God and humanity, coordinated with his ever abiding faith in the Constitutions of his state and nation, and the cautious deliberation he has exercised in making decisions on vital issues of a controversial nature and their consequential effect on all facets of our national social and economic life.

In the numerous capacities in which he has served his state and nation in the Legislative Department of our Government he has distinguished himself, with outstanding accomplishments, and a dedicated service of the highest quality, which accounts for his tremendous influence and the high esteem of his colleagues, with whom he has had the honor of serving for a longer period of years than the majority of legislators throughout the history of our great Republic.

Before presenting this distinguished award to Senator ROBERTSON, and for the information of those who are not too well acquainted with the basic philosophy and the inherent tenets and objectives of the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe, I would like to emphasize that its preamble is the Constitution of the United States; that it is a national, non-profit, non-partisan organization, comprising an official staff and membership of patriotic and dedicated Americans who believe implicitly in the preservation of the cardinal virtues of freedom that found their way into our nation's most sacred historical libertarian documents: The Declaration of Independence; The Constitution of the United States; buttressed by its Bill of Rights, and the administration of our republican form of Government as it was established and envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

This distinguished award to Senator ROBERTSON is appropriate in many ways. One of his ancestors was in the Governor Spotswood party that discovered the Valley of Virginia and whose expedition was later symbolized by a golden horseshoe. The former home on the Rapidan of Governor Spotswood, called "Germanna," was once owned by Senator ROBERTSON's grandfather.

With all of these things in mind and the courageous and effective political career of a great American Statesman, it is indeed an honored privilege and indeed, a great pleasure for me, as Virginia Divisional President representing the constituents and the official staff of the American Society of the Golden Horseshoe, to present to you, Senator ROBERTSON, this distinguished award, a Life Membership Card, and the emblem of our Society.

The presentation of this award, Senator ROBERTSON, indicates our high regard for you and our deep gratitude and appreciation of your outstanding performance and accomplishments as a noble and patriotic Virginia Statesman and legislator, and while we regret your forthcoming retirement from the United States Senate, we sincerely trust that in retirement you shall find great pleasure in reviewing the fruits of your labors as one of the nation's leading and esteemed legislators. We also hope that you shall be privileged to enjoy to the fullest extent the many facets of your home life, and the out-of-doors sports that you have been denied during the third of a century you have courageously served your state and nation in the distinguished Chambers of the United States

Congress. We pray God's blessings will be bestowed upon you and inspire and preserve you for many years to come.

DEATH OF CHARLES L. WATKINS, PARLIAMENTARIAN EMERITUS OF THE SENATE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join with my many colleagues in the Senate in expressing my condolences to the family of Mr. Charles L. Watkins, who passed away on Monday of this week.

Those of us who were fortunate enough to serve in the Senate during the time that Mr. Watkins served as the Parliamentarian of the Senate feel a deep loss on his passing. Mr. Watkins was the first official Parliamentarian the Senate ever had, and he set an example of ability, decorum, and dedication that I trust will long be followed by his successors. All of us had occasion to rely upon his knowledge of the Senate rules and his expert advice in seeking a solution to some knotty parliamentary problems. Mr. Watkins' advice and counsel was always unstintingly given to all Senators and their staffs without partiality or favor to any particular political point of view.

His courteous Christian conduct earned him the friendship of everyone with whom he came in contact during his long tenure in the Senate. He approached his job with the devotion and dedication that comes from an innate sense of responsibility. He contributed incalculably to the traditions and heritage of the Senate as the most deliberative parliamentary body in the world, and his compilation of Senate precedents is equalled only by Jefferson's manual.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent, as I have for the past several days, to place in the RECORD the prepared testimony of witnesses who appeared before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee on the question of prayer in public schools.

For those who may have missed the previous insertions they are as follows: August 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30. They may be found on the following pages of the RECORD: 20295, 20451, 20469, 20570, 20572, 20869, 21091, and 21176 respectively.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS BY THE REVEREND C. STANLEY LOWELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PROTESTANTS AND OTHER AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, AUGUST 8, 1966

Any study conducted by the Congress in the area with which the First Amendment is concerned should offer an occasion for the celebration of the Amendment itself. We do well to recall that the First Amendment, dealing with freedom of religion, is but one of ten amendments which cover many of the basic rights of man. This year marks the 175th anniversary of the Bill of Rights and we appropriately mark the blessings of this immortal document.

The first of these amendments guarantees the free exercise of religion and this freedom our people and our churches have enjoyed for a century and a half. The virility of the religious enterprise in this country indicates that we have taken full advantage of this freedom.

Basic to the free exercise of religion is the freedom to pray. Indeed, this is the fundamental freedom which the First Amendment in its present form patently bestows. The right of all our people to pray in their own way is guaranteed to them and government is forbidden to make any law prohibiting this. Congress can make no law—nor, as a result of the Fourteenth Amendment—can any state or official body among us make a law, which prohibits the free exercise of religion. The right of our people to pray in their own way, as and when they wish, could only be withdrawn by legislation enabled as a result of an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

We should be very clear that no decision of the Supreme Court has destroyed or outlawed anyone's freedom to pray. All the Supreme Court sought to do was to prohibit government from requiring religious exercises in the public schools. Since the right of the people to pray has not been abridged by the Supreme Court or any other body, and could not be so abridged under the present constitutional provision, any proposed change which bears upon this provision should be subjected to the closest scrutiny by religious leaders.

As one studies the proposal before you to amend the Constitution, he is at once taken with the fact that, despite its negative phrasing, it clearly injects government into the business of religion. Piercing the negative phrasing to get at the positive meaning of the proposal, we might read it this way: "The authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or every public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, shall have authority to provide for the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer." That is what the proposal says and that is what it means. It is an enabling provision. It would enable public officials to make arrangements for prayers. If the word prayer be defined broadly, as is done by many religious groups, then insinuation of public officials into this area of religious exercises and religious worship would seem to be made possible should this amendment prevail. We question the wisdom of any such proposal.

What must be considered in connection with any law is not merely the law itself but the administrative latitude with which it can be effectuated. The law may be innocuous enough and may seek to serve a commendable purpose, but if it gives officials administrative latitude which may be abused, then it is a bad law. We have a good example of this in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed by the Congress last year. The Congress attempted to avoid church-state entanglements in the drafting of this legislation, but it is now being administered in a manner which many allege does breach our constitutional separation of church and state. The administrative latitude that this proposed constitutional amendment would confer upon local officials in the matter of religion is enormous. Therein lies its danger to religious freedom.

In our estimate of this matter, prayer is basically of a private and personal nature and does not lend itself to government auspices. Prayer is too sacred an exercise for the state's management and manipulation. We believe that here is one area, above all, where government ought to keep out. The best thing that government can do for religion is to let it meticulously alone. James Madison

beautifully clarified this point in a message delivered in July, 1813. He said:

"If the public homage of a people can ever be worthy the favorable regard of the Holy and Omniscent Being to whom it is addressed, it must be that in which those who join in it are guided only by their free choice, by the impulse of their hearts and the dictates of their consciences; and such a spectacle must be interesting to all Christian nations as proving that religion, that gift of Heaven for the good of man, freed from all coercive edicts, from that unhallowed connection with the powers of this world which corrupts religion into an instrument or an usurper of that policy of the state, and making no appeal but to reason, to the heart, and to the conscience, can spread its benign influence everywhere and can attract to the divine altar those freewill offerings of humble supplication, thanksgiving, and praise which alone can be acceptable to Him whom no hypocrisy can deceive and no forced sacrifices propitiate."¹

We believe that developments indicated as a result of this amendment would point toward an erosion of separation between church and state and a creeping encroachment of government into the realm of religion. The amendment should therefore be rejected by all who are concerned for freedom of religion and its independent status viz the state.

A brief review of some of the developments which have occasioned a demand for such an amendment as this may be enlightening. It is true that our public schools had as their predecessors religious academies sponsored by churches. It is true that as the common schools superseded the religious academies, a number of sectarian emphases persisted in the later institutions. It is true, again, that these practices, notably Bible reading and prayers, were gradually eliminated and that their final elimination occurred following a series of decisions by the Supreme Court in the 1940s, '50s, and '60s.

It has been asserted that the elimination of these religious practices from the schools came about as a result of a plot to "drive God out of the schools" or to promote atheism or secularism among the youth. There is no truth whatever in such observations.

The elimination of religious exercises from the schools came about as a result of entirely practical and pragmatic considerations. So long as the country was predominantly and even overwhelmingly Protestant, the vestiges of Protestant worship and teaching remained in the schools without challenge. But as large and important religious minorities began to rise within the population, objections were heard. In a series of lawsuits which extended from the 19th into the 20th century Roman Catholic plaintiffs sought the elimination of such Protestant practices in the schools on the ground that they violated their own religious convictions. In the 1940s, '50s and '60s, Roman Catholic plaintiffs were replaced by Jews, Unitarians, humanists, and other minority groups who continued to challenge these surviving religious practices in the schools. They challenged them for exactly the same reason as the Catholics had done so: they wanted their children to be protected from religious indoctrination in a public institution which their children were required to attend by public law.

The New York case of *Engel v. Vitale* in 1962 provided the final demonstration of the futility of any effort to work out a general form of religious observance or exercise that would be satisfactory to all religious segments of the population. Children in the

¹ Brant, Irving, *The Bill of Rights: Its Origins and Meaning*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1965, pp. 418-19.

New York schools were being led in the repetition of a prayer so devoid of theological content that it could scarcely be called a prayer at all. It would have been difficult to imagine that any segment of the community would have objected to this exercise. Certainly no more general, no more inoffensive, no more innocuous prayer could have been devised than this one. Yet there were those who did object. A controversy erupted in the school, and in the community of such violence that it carried all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Other cases of the current period are likewise enlightening. In *McCullum v. Board of Education*, a 1948 Illinois case, the issue was religious instruction in the classroom. In *Zorach v. Clauson*, a 1952 New York case, the issue also related to religious instruction under school auspices. In the Pennsylvania case, *Schempp v. Abington Township*, 1963, the issue was Bible reading in the schools. In *Murray v. Curlett*, 1963, a Maryland case, the issue was prayers in the classroom. These were all cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. In addition, there were numerous cases in the lower courts which never reached the Supreme Court or were refused a hearing there. All of these cases dealt with similar issues relating to controversies over religious practices in the schools. Further still, there have been literally thousands of community controversies over such issues which never got into court.

What we are dealing with here is an area which carries an enormous potential for militant differences of opinion. The fact that we have had all this controversy and that the controversy is continuing, does not, as some have stated, indicate that secularism or atheism has taken over. On the contrary, what is indicated is a continuing concern for religion. If people were completely secularist in their viewpoint, or indifferent to religion, there would be no controversy. The whole matter would be ignored as one unworthy of serious attention. What all this controversy indicates is not that our people are irreligious or that they are indifferent to religion, but rather that they are positively religious according to sharply divergent patterns. Religion is an emotional matter. It is intimate, personal. Our people have strong feelings in regard to their religion. The thought of having religious practices of which they disapprove, even though these practices be of the most general nature, forced upon their children under compulsory attendance laws is repugnant to them. All that is needed to bring dissension and bitterness to thousands of communities throughout our country is some hint of this on the part of public officials.

Because religion is thus intimate and personal and highly emotional in its overtones, our system of separation of church and state has wisely made it a matter outside of government purview. We have enjoyed religious peace because of this fact and it is our hope that we can continue on the same basis. We do not question that more practice of prayer is needed. But prayer belongs properly in the area of personal experience, in the church, in the home, in voluntary associations. It has nothing to do with the coercive process of government which, under the guise of "providing for and permitting" could put public officials into the business of making religious arrangements.

What kind of arrangements could public school officials be expected to make? Obviously, they would provide for prayers on the basis with which they were familiar or which they believed the majority favored. Thus, in the school my children currently attend the voluntary prayers provided for would undoubtedly be Jewish since the fol-

lowers of that faith have a slight majority in the school. I have great respect for the Jewish faith but my children are Christian. I am sure that arrangements favoring Jewish prayers would arouse the protest and rebellion of the Christian minority. In a school in Hawaii which has a 51 per cent Buddhist majority, the prayer arrangements provided for would undoubtedly be Buddhist. Christians and others might have the right to walk out if they did not approve. This is religion by majority fiat and the way for it is open by the amendment proposed here.

Some have inquired whether a majority has no rights in these matters. This issue should be met squarely; the majority has no rights over the minority in matters of religion. In our democratic political processes the device of the majority is a useful one. It provides a convenient *modus vivendi* for making decisions and getting things done. But the genius of a free people, where religion is involved, is not an imposition by a majority but a respect for minorities. Where would the few Protestants be in Boston if we had religion by majority rule there? Where would the few Roman Catholics in North Carolina be if we had religious majority rule there? It is good sense as well as an assurance of religious freedom that we have never attempted to proceed in this fashion. Yet the proposal to change the First Amendment which you have under consideration definitely points in that direction. It could seriously jeopardize good relations among the faiths and undermine community peace. We hope that the Committee will not regard this proposal favorably.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. BAZARIAN BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 1, 1966, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 148

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee—I am honored, indeed, to have been invited to share in these important deliberations.

I represented the Plaintiffs in the case of *Stein v. Oshinsky*—the "voluntary prayer case." The Plaintiffs were infants attending classes at P.S. 184, Whitestone, New York. After the Supreme Court had decided *Engel v. Vitale* in 1962, the principal of P.S. 184 in Whitestone, New York ordered all his teachers to stop all children in the school from reciting prayers. At that time the prayers being used were in the kindergarten and first grade classes and were the "milk and cookie" prayers we have heard so much about. The principal's order applied not only to these prayers, but to all prayers. The action of the principal, Elihu Oshinsky, was upheld by the New York City Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the State of New York.

At that point, the parents of the infants caused a Notice to be served upon the Defendants demanding that their children be given "an opportunity to express their love and affection to Almighty God each day through a prayer in their respective classrooms." The important fact here is that the Notice signed by the fifteen parents on behalf of the twenty-one infants who subsequently became parties in the action were in all classes and grades of P.S. 184—kindergarten through sixth grade. All wanted to pray in school. All were denied the right to express their love and affection to Almighty God. All were silenced and thus denied their right of Free Exercise of Religion as well as their right of Free Speech. The complaint in the suit of *Stein v. Oshinsky* was framed around these facts. Incidentally, the Plaintiffs were of Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, Armenian Apostolic, and Episcopalian faiths.

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution says in part:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech."

After the decision of the Supreme Court in *Engel v. Vitale*, it seemed to me that a voluntary prayer program, such as I outlined in *Stein v. Oshinsky*, was a solution to a problem which had achieved enormous proportions.

A careful reading of the opinion in *Engel v. Vitale* gave me no reason to think that the Supreme Court would not consider such a program. Indeed, after having read *Abington v. Schempp* and *Murray v. Curlett*, I believed that the doctrine of neutrality as further outlined by Mr. Justice Clark would not only permit such a program, but indeed, I felt that the Court would seek it as a compromise. I believed this not only because it was expedient for the Court to so rule in that the polls indicate that approximately 80% of the people want prayers in school and are unable to understand why the Courts seek to remove them, but because the law as it was developing toward greater personal liberties demanded that the right of free speech and free exercise of religion be extended to the infant student. Such was not to be the case. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed Judge Bruchhausen's ruling in the Eastern District of New York permitting the voluntary prayer program, and the Supreme Court of the United States denied Certiorari upon Plaintiffs' petition.

The Plaintiffs in *Stein v. Oshinsky* contended that the action of the principal of the P.S. 184 and the action of the New York City Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the State of New York was an amorphous practice without the guidelines of any statute of law. It was the use of the power of the State in a purely blatant, dictatorial and arbitrary manner. The State interposed itself between persons who wished to say a prayer and the saying of that prayer.

We note that Mr. Justice Clark, in *Abington School District v. Schempp*, at 374 U.S. 226 says:

"In the relationship between man and religion, the State is firmly committed to a position of neutrality. Though the application of that rule requires interpretation of a delicate sort, the rule itself is clearly and concisely stated in the words of the First Amendment."

Mr. Justice Clark propounded a test to determine a violation of the Doctrine of Neutrality. He said at 274 U.S. 222-3.

"What are the purpose and the primary effect of the enactment: If either it is the advancement or inhibition of religion then the enactment exceeds the scope of legislative power as circumscribed by the Constitution."

The Plaintiffs in *Stein v. Oshinsky* contended that the banning of prayers by the Defendants had as its purpose the preferment of those who do not believe in God over those who do believe and as its primary effect is used the awesome power of the State to thwart the education of pupils attending public school. It places parents in the impossible position of explaining to immature minds why they must park their belief in God at the curb when they enter public school. The enactment of a ban against voluntary prayer in effect "establishes" atheism as the official belief of the State to be foisted upon an unwilling majority.

In *Engel*, *Abington* and *Murray*, the Supreme Court held that prayers composed by the State and Bible reading and prayer programs required by statute were in violation of the Constitutional prohibition against the

establishment of religion. In *Stein v. Oshinsky* the Free Exercise Clause alone was at issue.

The interpretations given to these cases by the Courts, by public officials, by Boards of Education, by principals of schools and others have resulted in a comedy of errors which is tragic to behold.

At no time in my handling of the Stein case did I criticize the Supreme Court for its decisions in *Engel*, *Abington* or *Murray*. In fact, I always attempted to distinguish our case from them. However, we have arrived at a position where the Courts ruled that the prayer and Bible reading programs, as they were conducted under State law, were unconstitutional because they violated the Establishment Clause. When the Stein case sought to reinstate them under the Free Exercise Clause, the Circuit Court of Appeals held that school authorities had the power to ban them. It is this power of school Boards to ban prayers that gives me the greatest concern.

The Supreme Court, it must be emphasized, has held that school Boards may be required not to deprive their constituents of their Constitutional rights and that these Constitutional rights may be enforced by Court order. Namely, Negro children may not be deprived of their right to attend integrated schools and school Boards may be compelled to integrate their student bodies. Yet, in *Stein v. Oshinsky* the Court does not consider the right of free speech and the right of free exercise of religion important enough to prevent school authorities from interfering with these Constitutional rights.

Again, Mr. Justice Clark, in *Abington* had said that: "In the relationship between man and religion the State is firmly committed to a position of neutrality."

It seems to me that the doctrine of neutrality and the Constitutional prohibition against any law prohibiting the free exercise of religion would require school officials not to make any rule or regulation with respect to prayers. That doctrine of neutrality and the constitution should mean that the state could neither require prayers nor prohibit the voluntary recitation of prayers, neither fostering them nor disfavoring them. The only rule which could possibly be made by school officials would be one which would give the pupils an opportunity to voluntarily recite a prayer each day to Almighty God in their classrooms. This rule would be purely procedural in nature and in no way would be substantive. It is for this reason that I think that S.J. Resolution 148 is exactly in point and fulfills the requirements of the Constitution as well as the doctrine of neutrality.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refresh your recollection that the House of Representatives, Second Session of the 88th Congress, in connection with the Becker Amendment and other proposed amendments to the First Amendment, held hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. On April 30, 1964, Dr. Leo Pfeffer, one of the most ardent advocates of the Doctrine of separation of church and state, who has appeared before the Courts on almost every Church-State issue of our time testified:

"... A completely erroneous assumption which seems to be prevailing among those who testified here, and I am afraid among some members of the committee. A completely erroneous assumption that the Supreme Court or any decision of the Supreme Court or any courts of the United States from the lowest to the highest courts have forbidden children to read the Bible or pray in public schools.

"Nothing could be further from the truth. There is not one word in any decision of the Supreme Court including *Murray*, *Engel*, *Zorach*, or *McCullum*, or any State court de-

cision which can, to any extent, be interpreted as forbidding children to pray or to read the Bible in the public schools.

"I suppose if in the middle of an arithmetic class a child got a feeling, a need of praying out loud and would do so, I presume it would be within the authority of the schoolteacher to say to him, 'This is not the time to do it.' But subject to the obligation not to disturb the ordinary course of the school curriculum nothing in the Supreme Court decision—

"The CHAIRMAN. What did it do?

"Mr. PFEFFER. All it says is that the State through its agencies cannot promote or establish the reading of the Bible or recitation of prayers. Nothing at all to the effect that the children may not of their own or at the request of their parents, who have the primary obligation, may not pray in the public school, subject, as I say, to the necessity of discipline. This is the whole basis of the first amendment.

"The first amendment has two parts. One part says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion and the other says no law prohibiting its free exercise. If a child felt it necessary to say a prayer before partaking of bread or milk or cookies and the State says you can't do that, it would be a violation of the free exercise clause and just as unconstitutional as the Supreme Court says in *Murray* it is for the teacher to say to the children that you will now say grace or read from the Bible.

"The first amendment's guarantees secure rights to the individual and restricts the State. They are against statism. They say to the State in the matter of religion you keep your hands off. This is the sacred right, the sacred duty of each individual as a creature of God who alone can decide whether his child shall pray and what form the prayer shall be, if they read the Bible what version of the Bible.

"Hence, there is nothing in these decisions, and I challenge any person to find one word in them which interferes with any person's 'religious liberty' to pray or worship as he sees fit, subject again to the qualification that in exercising his right he may not disturb his neighbor who at the time may be reading history or grammar and would be disturbed by a vocal prayer."

SCHOOL PRAYER HEARINGS, PART I, PP. 923, 924

Dr. Pfeffer's testimony was, of course, given before the House Judiciary Committee prior to the decision of the Circuit Court and the denial of Certiorari by the Supreme Court in the Stein Case.

How wrong Dr. Pfeffer was!

How I wish he had been right!

For, if he were right, the Stein case would have been affirmed by the Courts. Voluntary prayers would have been constitutional in that they would have been permitted under the constitutional guarantees of Free Exercise and Free Speech. These hearings would have been unnecessary.

Our founding fathers were men of faith who wanted religion woven into the fabric of American life. Into the Northwest Ordinance, the First Congress promulgated its intentions: "Religion being necessary, . . . schools shall be forever encouraged." Since that time religion has in fact been woven into the fabric of American life. Prayers were said by school children from the time the first school house was opened upon this continent. The drafters of the Constitution were particularly careful to insure that freedom of religion and freedom of speech were not to be infringed. The constitutional prohibition in the First Amendment that "Congress (and the states under the decisions of the Fourteenth Amendment) shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion" guarantees that the state cannot compel an

individual or group of individuals to accept its views or any view on religion. Under the free exercise clause, it guarantees the individual at least his opportunity to express his views at any time, at any place, even in public school. We have seen the proper balance between these two rights properly weighed and evaluated in *West Virginia v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, where the right of Jehovah's Witnesses not to salute the flag was not imposed upon those who would. Surely the rights of the atheist, the infidel, the irreligious man to refrain from prayer cannot be imposed upon those who would pray. How can we justify the removal of prayer from public schools or from public life on such grounds?

We have in our history of national growth come to an era when we are beginning to realize that segregation of groups is an unhealthy one. By such segregation, the segregating group and the segregated group both suffer. We have come to realize that both groups in true integration can benefit from one another, resulting in a more perfect whole. Yet, with the ban upon prayers, we are segregating ourselves into cubbyholes so small, so narrow that no light can shine upon any. The wall of separation of state and religion (not church) is to become complete. We deprive the Protestant child from the views of the Jewish child. We deprive the Catholic child from the views of the Episcopalian; the Lutheran child from the Armenian Apostolic; the Islamic from the Buddhist and this in our institutions of learning where ideas and knowledge and their dissemination are its only products. According to John Henry Newman's "The Idea of a University, Discourse VI, Liberal Knowledge Viewed in Relation to Learning":

"Knowledge is the indispensable condition of expansion of mind. . . . A narrow mind is thought to be that which contains little knowledge and an enlarged mind, that which holds a deal."

Are our minds to become so narrow, so filled with fear, that we dare not learn and acquire knowledge of one another and of God? Has freedom of religion come to mean freedom from religion? Has the basic breakdown of a moralistic way of life caused us to become so apathetic that we care not either for our freedoms or for the glory of God through prayer?

Have we as Americans become so dependent upon rules and regulations, so avid for laws and security that we permit government, including Boards of Education, to lay down rules and regulations banning prayer?

Under the circumstances, we see the effects of government attempting to arrive at a predetermined objective—to wit: the total banning of prayers and abolition of the name God from school without following the due process of law. We see the effects of such bans against the free exercises of religion and the right of free speech as dictatorial, intolerant and cruel. In effect, it is a policy of thought control, and this in our institutions of learning where minds must be free to soar to unlimited heights. It constitutes a policy of "book burning" reminiscent of the earliest days of Adolph Hitler.

Ban prayers in school today; ban prayers on street and in public places; follow that with a ban on prayers or evidence of prayers on radio and television—inevitably it will be followed by thought control in every phase of public life. Is it impossible to say that streets and airwaves are tax supported and operate under public franchise?

Certainly, the doctrine of neutrality heretofore discussed requires Boards of Education, not only to keep its hands off state composed prayers and rules and regulations requiring prayers but also includes the necessity that Boards of Education and all gov-

ernment keep its hands off all rules and all regulations denying the right to pray. Indeed, our attitude is one of incensed indignation of so bold an attitude on this "first experiment on our liberties."

A NEW WORLD FOOD POLICY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to express my personal appreciation to some of those who have had a part in developing this program and particularly to one of our number who has espoused it day in and day out for the past 4 years, written a book on the need for such a policy, and introduced the first International Food and Nutrition bill in this body about 14 months ago.

It takes the combined efforts of a great many people to forge and enact legislation as significant as the Food for Peace Act of 1966, which is now going to conference and will soon be law. That has been true in this case.

Following Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's introduction of his International Food and Nutrition Act on June 17 last year, an administration task force made an intensive study of our world food programs and policies, and the necessity for moving from a program based on the disposal of our own burdensome agricultural surpluses to an affirmative world food policy. Based on that study, the President submitted an excellent, constructive bill to Congress.

As the Senator from South Dakota has already pointed out, Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, the chairman, and the House Agriculture Committee conducted searching hearings and adopted a fine bill. The chairman and members of the Senate Agriculture Committee have given a great deal of their time and energy to the development of the measure we have just approved.

Throughout this process, there has been one man writing, speaking, proposing amendments to various measures to start us moving toward a real war against hunger, developing a legislative proposal, and educating us to the nature of the impending world food crisis—the former Food for Peace Director, now our colleague, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN. He has kept the attention of both officials and the public constantly on the race between food and population.

He has been in my State on several occasions to address meetings on the subject, and I know that he has made a great many addresses elsewhere to arouse people to the importance of adopting an enlightened world food policy both to assist struggling peoples abroad and to strengthen both the economy and the security of our own land.

I cannot avoid comparing the Senator from South Dakota in my own mind with Wisconsin's most renowned legislator, Senator Bob La Follette, whose portrait is in the Senate waiting room as a result in his selection by a bipartisan commission as one of this Nation's most effective legislators.

Bob La Follette did much of his campaigning for the enactment of legislation out among the people. He was tireless; he accepted every invitation

that time would permit to espouse his causes and educate everyone who would listen about the problems that gave him concern. He created opportunities to be heard when interest lagged. He would not let an issue die from inattention, but kept it constantly in the forefront until a decision was made.

We have witnessed the same sort of persistence, of marshaling of public support, and of directing attention back time after time to this issue of worldwide importance, on the part of our colleague. He has followed much the same course in relation to farm programs and other issues he regards of high priority.

It was my privilege to cosponsor with him the International Food and Nutrition Act on June 17 last year. Consequently, I take a great deal of pleasure in the Senate's approval of the Food for Peace Act of 1966 today, not only because it is an exceptionally creative program, but because of the satisfaction it must bring to the Senator from South Dakota, who has given so much of his energy and ability to the adoption of this program.

The bill we have passed, which moves our world food policy from sharing surpluses to one of deliberate production of foodstuffs to meet need abroad while food and population are brought into balance, is a history-making measure. Perhaps it is because he is a historian by profession that GEORGE MCGOVERN has given it top priority in his allocation of his time and energy during his first 4 years in the Senate.

In all events, without diminishing the great credit that is due the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Agriculture Committee chairmen and many others in relation to this bill, I want to congratulate the junior Senator from South Dakota for his key role in the enactment of this new U.S. world food policy.

In the process, he has added a great book and several great and studious speeches to our literature. And he has set us all an example of effective legislative operation, reaching all the way from the grassroots to this Chamber.

I congratulate him, and say to him, on behalf of myself and others who have depended on him in this matter, that he has made a real contribution to strengthening our Nation and making this a better world.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on Sunday, August 21, the "Meet the Press" program broadcast on a national television program embraced a number of participants who discussed the civil rights bill. I have had considerable mail vigorously taking exception to remarks that were made by participants Floyd B. McKissick, the head of CORE; Stokely Carmichael, of SNCC; and James H. Meredith, who works for himself.

In the Wednesday, August 24, issue of the Cleveland Press, in the column of Forrest Allen there appeared a sound and constructive analysis of the program.

In my opinion it so excellently analyzes the wrongness of what was done in

that program that it warrants that the Forrest Allen column be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME NEGROES OVERSTEP IN ADVOCATING ANARCHY

(By Forrest Allen)

Some Negro leaders are now speaking out with a fierce candor and blunt directness that so far seldom finds its match on the side of the whites.

However painful it is, it seems to me that the tolerant white person can no longer remain silent. If the term "equal rights" means anything, it must mean that a white man has as much right to express his views in public as a man of any other hue.

I watched and listened to an amazing hour and a half TV program Sunday. Several reporters discussed civil rights with Negro leaders, including Floyd B. McKissick, head of CORE, Stokely Carmichael, SNCC, and James H. Meredith, who works for himself.

In the orderly, sequestered chamber of a television studio, I saw and heard a direct challenge to a government of law.

Carmichael, a native of Trinidad, said that he considered himself a citizen of the U.S. "on paper" only. To him all whites are anti-black, and the N.Y. Times is "that anti-black newspaper."

"When you talk about black power you talk about bringing this country to its knees anytime it messes with the black man," Carmichael said in answer to a question about a speech he'd made in Cleveland.

Meredith, whose violent and tradition-breaking entrance into the University of Mississippi was made possible by a national administration led by whites, said that Negroes must take the law into their own hands wherever whites fail to arrest, prosecute and convict the slayer of a Negro.

In Mississippi, Meredith said, his people "know the people that killed all of the Negroes. . . . I am here to say that these people have to be removed from our society. If they (the whites) don't find a way, the Negro has no choice but to remove them."

Do you mean formation of Negro vigilantes to punish people outside the law? he was asked.

"That is exactly what I am saying," Meredith replied. To which Carmichael added, "I agree 150%. The black people will have to move into positions to protect themselves."

The doctrine expressed by Carmichael and Meredith is anarchy. It is an advocacy of force above and beyond the law. It is a declaration that if what the Negro demands is not yielded up to him, he must arm and take it by his own force.

Or, as Carmichael put it, we'll all go down together.

I do not believe it does the cause of civil rights any good for the white man to leave these declarations unanswered. I am equally certain that we are fast moving toward the edge of an abyss where nothing can be solved by consultation and discussion.

Force, violence—the torch, the rock and the gun—these will find more and more acceptance, until we reach the day reason has abandoned us all.

It may be disastrous politics, poor business and sad public relations to speak out against the counsel of a Carmichael. But when these wild statements are thrown at us from nationwide forums, then responsible men and women should stand up and tell us what they think of the things these preachers of destruction are saying.

THE THREAT TO THAILAND

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last spring I had the opportunity to take a look for myself at the situation in south-east Asia—at Vietnam and also at Thailand. I was greatly impressed by what I observed in the northeast provinces of Thailand, an area being threatened with subversion by the Chinese dictators of Peking.

The Thais are guarding against becoming another Vietnam, although the enemy is using the same tactics in pursuing a so-called war of liberation in that area and has secret cadres at work terrorizing the countryside. Thailand, indeed, may be the next on mainland China's list, but Thailand, as former U.S. Ambassador Kenneth Young has written, is no Vietnam. In an article published on Sunday, August 28, by the Washington Post, Ambassador Young sets forth well the situation in Thailand. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAILAND MAY BE NEXT BUT IT IS NO VIETNAM

(By Kenneth T. Young)

(Former Ambassador to Thailand, Young is head of the Asia Society in New York.)

Will Thailand be another Vietnam is the question many Thais and Americans are asking. The contest for Thailand has indeed begun in earnest, for it is now Peking's proclaimed target for subversion. But we will not find ourselves with another Vietnam. Thailand is different.

The Thais can still ward off another Maoist "war of liberation," or "war by seepage," as I prefer to call it, if they engineer a political rather than a military solution. Their success is essential for us because an independent, stabilized Southeast Asia needs the dynamic, solid core of Thailand, and Thailand can make the difference if it makes the most of its assets.

Thailand is slowly welding its regional segments—the dissimilar Moslem south abutting Malaysia, the distinctive northern crown so close to China and the refractory northeast bordering Laos nearby North Vietnam—into the rice-rich central plain, which is growing prosperous and industrialized around booming Bangkok. However, we should not overstress the ethnic and geographic separatism of the northeast, where its nearly 10 million people now look to Bangkok rather than Vientiane.

An enlightened and popular King personifies national unity and Thai-Buddhist ideals for most of the population and significantly for the professionally oriented younger Thais who will soon be moving up into power. There is a quite competent civil service and the unifying influences of Buddhism and prosperity are helping to coagulate the various ethnic minorities except the Vietnamese in the northeast.

APATHETIC HINTERLAND

The main trouble Thailand faces in coping with actual Communist revolutionary warfare comes from the physical and psychological gap between the government and the people in remote, vulnerable borderlands. Long neglected and apathetic politically, the villagers live in a small unchanging world of their own making where until recently even the King and the Prime Minister were sometimes unknown.

In Southeast Asia, villagers have traditionally feared, resented and even hated the

"government." Officials have tended to be harsh and overbearing with rural folk. After centuries of mutual antagonism, there is a deep psychological gap that the Communists can seep, peel off Thailand layer by layer and paralyze Bangkok if a political alternative is not pressed.

In this political vacuum, the villagers are "up for grabs" by whichever side fields the winning combination: the effective agents, attractive incentives and organizing talents. Here, at the outset, Thailand is no different, for the Asian Communists are experts in their style of rural revolution.

Progress and protection must go together to win. The key to Thailand's lasting safety lies in a better revolution to fill the rural vacuum. This means creating a whole new national identity in two directions.

Only a self-restrained civilian and military officialdom knowing how to gain the respect and trust of the rural people can win them over. And only a self-propelled rural people feeling their own stake and welcoming outside aid in developing and protecting their homes, temples, rice fields, schools and villages can repel Communist agents and insurgents.

Another difference for Thailand is that Peking rather than Hanoi poses as the chief adversary. Every day we read another report of Communist activity in northeastern or southern Thailand. The emerging pattern of discredited local authority and little security in isolated villages is familiar, for South Vietnam was like this at the outset.

In northeastern Thailand, secret meetings, quick ambushes and sudden death for officials and teachers, all by furtive Thai—not alien—insurgents, are the telltale signs of this "aggression by seepage."

There are reports that Americans can no longer safely stay in some villages in two northeastern areas that I was able to survey securely with Thai officials in 1962-63.

These were sparsely inhabited regions which now are the forward sanctuaries of a new insurgent movement. They are new way stations in Peking's proxy envelopment, stage by stage, of Southeast Asia.

The key feature of the misnamed "war of liberation" is revolutionary indoctrination of the countryside. Its unique style is a clever mixture of exploiting actual rural discontents, recruiting disgruntled individuals, bringing villages into submission by promises or terror, violently uprooting any official presence and organizing a new village political structure.

Communism does not come into the picture at first. Silent on Leninism, seepage is loud on localism catering to village complaints and speaking in the rural idiom. This device that has bedeviled our Vietnamese friends for a decade is bound to shake up Thailand's regional fringes and its central status quo. They will never be quite the same again. Unfortunately, this could not have happened to a nicer people.

A NEW EXCUSE

This real threat did not exist when Laos was "neutralized" in 1962. The danger was still potential. Now, Peking and Hanoi claim to have an added reason to hurt Thailand. According to Peking, Thailand has sent military elements into Laos and South Vietnam and is serving as "a bridgehead of U.S. aggression against Indochina."

But even before that, Peking had sponsored the "Thailand Patriotic Front," which was more audio than visual. The real thing is the secret cadres in the jungles, hills and homes. So far, outright Communist attack has served more to alert than to frighten, for the campaign in Thailand is still small-scale. The question is whether time, still in hand, will be turned to Thailand's advantage.

Bangkok has already taken some initiative to bring the government's "presence" into

many outlying rural areas, particularly in the critical northeast but also in the north, so accessible from China, and in the south, where Chinese guerrillas operate out of a deep jungle sanctuary along the Malaysian border. Bangkok has begun assigning some of its most able civilian and military administrators to these areas. This orientation away from Bangkok is a radical and significant innovation in Thailand's efforts to build a modern nation and cope with alien subversion.

Moreover, Bangkok has instituted genuine pioneering in "rice-roots" political development. Since 1960, it has been conducting training programs, to help village headmen, county officials and provincial governors in dealing sympathetically with the rural people. At the lowest level of filling the political vacuum, the government recently started a program of village democracy and village self-defense in several sensitive places. And since 1962, the government has been sending mobile information teams scouting through thousands of villages to find out what the people really need and to acquaint them with the concern of their government.

To close the physical gap, the government has been creating a modern communications network quickly and going more slowly with time-consuming roadbuilding. Some village chiefs—but not enough—have American two-way radios to keep in daily contact with district headquarters.

Dirt airstrips for small planes and helicopters are beginning to dot rural areas, connecting them for the first time in the rainy season with provincial capitals and Bangkok. American bulldozers are starting to weave a pattern of roads across the countryside, but notwithstanding much American aid, Bangkok makes the decisions and the Thais do the operating.

To bridge the psychological gap, Bangkok has pioneered two more Thai-style techniques, the Mobile Development Unit and Accelerated Rural Development. They are vigorously implanting Bangkok's presence and image in many rural areas. Under a militarized national command, an MDU is a group of about 100 doctors, engineers, social workers, agriculturalists, etc., which goes out to several hundred villages to "take happiness to the rural population," as the Thais have distinctively put it.

A dozen MDUs have each spent about six months in vulnerable areas, mixing with the people, identifying their needs and providing them with the guidance, materials and tools to get jobs done quickly—jobs usually selected by the MDU, not the people. The pace is fast, the impact immediate but the lasting results sometimes uncertain. The MDU technique seems to lack the political action necessary to sustain village self-propulsion and satisfy local expectations.

Nor has the other technique yet clicked in either sense. Accelerated Rural Development was conceived as the longer-stage follow-up to the MDU. Reversing traditional practice, it has decentralized decisions and operations from Bangkok to the provincial governors.

Specifically, ARD is stimulating and supporting rural projects wanted by the local people, construction activities such as village roads, new wells, market places and rural electrification and farmers' associations for credit services, marketing activities and research. While it has made several major administrative improvements, it has apparently been slow in "accelerating" development so far.

SECURITY IMPROVING

Security development, to prevent or put down insurgency, has understandably moved further and faster in a country where the military controls political power and maintains martial law. Good information and

coordination among security units seem to be steadily increasing. A local police force is slowly improving in technical, as distinct from political, competence; some observers have questioned whether the policemen have yet been adequately trained in basic human relations.

Meanwhile, the capability of the Thai army, air force and marines to undertake versatile night-time and guerrilla-type operations has decidedly improved since 1961. However, the need for good local defense has not yet met the new test of will and style. Now the tendency may be to "overmilitarize" the response to intensified Communist subversion when basic political development should have priority.

Yet we should not expect real results overnight. The status quo gets in the way of innovation. Coming up with the winning combination in rural insurgency is a formidable business. But without a successful political solution, the government's new civilian and military presence in rural Thailand might even fuel the wrong revolution if officialdom behaves in the same old automatic way.

A LONG FRIENDSHIP

The third major difference between Thailand and Vietnam is Bangkok's distinctive partnership with Washington; a century-long experience of friendship, the SEATO Treaty, many joint efforts in development and defense and around a billion dollars in American economic and military aid since 1950. Now there is a highly visible and growing American military presence in much of the kingdom.

Although it has its weaknesses, Thailand is a dependable ally and has often gone all the way for us. We have a moral and legal obligation not to leave it in the lurch. Moreover, it would not be wise to overlook Thailand's authentic role in Asian affairs.

It is to be hoped, then, that both Bangkok and Washington will turn this "war of liberation" into a gambler's joke by applying the reforms of rural insurgency: popularizing and legitimizing the government presence; realizing the villagers' real wants and identifying the actual Communists; respecting local preference concerning leadership, justice, security and change; following up with suitable assistance, and insuring instant defense by local men and acceptable outsiders.

The Thais are wonderful people in many ways. They are known especially for their gentle, relaxed philosophy as expressed in their saying, "Mye ben rye," or "Never mind." But now many of them do mind—very much—what happens to their never colonized kingdom.

With their own brand of forward-looking nationalism, they want to do whatever is necessary, no matter how unorthodox by their lights, to retain ownership of the ground they stand on, as they always have so proudly. That could make the real difference in the long run for Thailand, Southeast Asia and the United States.

CYRUS EATON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most tireless and devoted champions of peace is Mr. Cyrus Eaton, the noted industrialist. Recently the Washington Post acclaimed him as an "unofficial ambassador of peace."

Although Mr. Eaton's financial fortune would have enabled him to lead a life of comparative ease, he has given of his time, his energy, and his wisdom to advance initiatives designed to move the world toward peace.

On July 31, 1966, the Sunday magazine section of the Toledo Blade carried an

interesting account about the life and motivation of this outstanding American.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO FEARS, NO REGRETS: THE CONTROVERSIAL CYRUS EATON PLAYS HIS OWN TUNE

(By George Barmann, Blade special writer)

Once in Cleveland's long-ago days, Cyrus S. Eaton went down to the railroad station to meet his father who was coming in for a visit from the family home at Pugwash, Nova Scotia. They had not seen each other for quite some time.

"Dad," Mr. Eaton, a tall and handsome young man, said with a fine balance of bounce and gravity, "what would you do if you had a million dollars?"

The two men strolled together for a moment or two in the splendid summer evening without saying anything. Then the father said he believed what he'd do was just go out and buy everything in the world he had ever wanted.

"Well," the younger Eaton said, "I'm a little puzzled. I've got between \$3 and \$4 million and I don't know what to do with it."

Cyrus Eaton, then, really did not have much of a choice for the future. He simply had to go on making money. He did.

The noted Cleveland industrialist, financier, and farmer, whose looks and bearing remind one of the dean of a university, or perhaps a cardinal, went ahead to become one of the tall towers of solvency on the American landscape and a figure of lively controversy around the world.

Cyrus Stephen Eaton, now 82, is a lusty builder of empires in coal, railroads, utilities, shipping, and iron and steel. His corporate assets are counted in the billions. His ventures have been on the grand scale. He is possibly the last of the tycoons.

The man who first wanted to be a Baptist minister, but changed his mind after he met John D. Rockefeller, directs these crackling lines of financial power from his 36th floor office in Terminal Tower, in downtown Cleveland, where often you can almost see across Lake Erie to his native Canada.

And in this office, too, Mr. Eaton often discusses poetry, tennis, Shakespeare, horseback riding, his prize cattle, skiing, and history and philosophy—and his continuing crusade for friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Eaton carries that crusade to all who will listen. He speaks of it at the august Union Club on Euclid Avenue. He presses for it at his famous annual Pugwash conferences of world intellectuals. He argues it before businessmen and journalists here and abroad. It is his great mission, and a controversial one.

The image of Mr. Eaton, the renowned capitalist, embracing the Russian bear has confused a great many Americans, not to mention the bear. He talks well of the Soviets. He visits them in Moscow and in the satellite countries. He entertains them at his farm. He sends bulls to the Reds. "It is better to trade bulls than bullets," he says.

Mr. Eaton and his pretty wife half his age, Anne Kinder Jones Eaton, who is confined to a wheelchair because of polio many years ago, jointly strive for this, perhaps their richest prize—the easing of tensions between the world giants. They hope that one day their peace crusade will pay off. Only history will decide.

A soft-spoken man, with arctic hair and alert, frosty blue eyes, Mr. Eaton is the kind of person who rises and approaches a guest; he does not wait for you. In an interview

in his office, he poured out a glass of mineral water for himself and straightened a single red rose in a vase on his desk. "Yes," he said, "every morning I have one red rose."

I STILL HAVE MANY THINGS TO DO

After you notice his hair and eyes, you see his well-kept hands. And the lack of jewelry. No rings, no wristwatch. The double-breasted blue suit, the white shirt with French cuffs, the pale blue tie. And you notice how erect he stands.

"Now I don't want to emphasize my age," he said. "I am quite unconscious of my age. I need the cooperation of many young men in my business, you see. I still do about everything I was doing when I was 16. I have been blessed with excellent health. I still have many things to do . . ."

You remember what a classmate of Mr. Eaton once said in Nova Scotia: "I'll never forget the first day he came into the school-room at Pugwash. He had the bluest eyes, the fairest hair, and the pinkest cheeks you ever saw, and he was the envy of all the ladies and a perfect little gentleman."

And what another countryman of his said one time: "He is still one of the best-looking men Canada ever produced."

IT'S BETTER TO TRADE BULLS THAN BULLETS

Mr. Eaton's father, a farmer and shopkeeper, who died some years ago in the little lumbering and fishing village of Pugwash, once recalled: "When my son was 6, I could leave him alone in the store for hours and he never failed my confidence. His qualifications for big business are brains and absolute trustworthiness."

Mr. Eaton is chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, whose merger with the rich Norfolk & Western Railway is in the works. Some time ago, the C&O acquired control of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Eaton, however, is involved in so many different financial concerns that a list would be endless.

In a sense, he is like his mentor, old John D. He scorns the vulgarities of tycoons and has climbed ever upward, with ascetic detachment, to that Olympus on which the few eagles gather who can find full self-expression only in hundreds of millions.

As the years went on, reports of his career regularly appeared in the newspapers, here and in Canada, but the precise details of his start always have been a bit hazy. One story has it that he was invited to join in the formation of a gas company by a parishioner of a suburban church, where he was serving as minister, although not ordained.

Another version is that he once sat next to John D. at the latter's Euclid Avenue Baptist Church and afterwards the oil king offered him a job with the East Ohio Gas Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil.

Whichever is correct, it is a fact that within eight years of his entrance into the utility business, Mr. Eaton was estimated to control \$2 billion of invested money in gas, power, light, and traction companies in the Midwest. By 1930, he was known as a leading utility magnate.

Cyrus Eaton was born Dec. 27, 1883, in Pugwash. He left home at 17 to work his way through college in Canada. After graduation, he came to Cleveland as a theological student at the suggestion of the pastor of the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, who was his uncle. Later he took up U.S. citizenship.

After his move into utilities, the depression struck. Mr. Eaton became involved in a stock-buying battle with Samuel Insull, then a top utility mogul. It ended in 1930 with Insull ruined and Mr. Eaton relatively unhurt. When the smoke of the crash lifted, it was observed that Mr. Eaton was still driving to work in Cleveland behind a chauffeur "smiling serenely."

In later years, he invaded the domain of the steel barons, controlling hundreds of ventures.

At 70, Mr. Eaton began his career in railroading, acquiring the C&O, the great coal hauler to the Great Lakes. He became the "savior" of two towns—Portsmouth, O., and Follansbee, W. Va.—where plants and jobs were facing extinction, and of a newspaper, the Cincinnati Enquirer, to which he lent \$10 million. Some said he wished to prevent the Taft interests from acquiring another communications property.

One of his greatest industrial triumphs involved the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., in western Ontario. Disregarding advice, he raised \$40 million, changed the course of a river, and drained a lake. Underneath lay a fantastic store of iron ore. The gamble paid off. Other interests have brought him into far-off business waters—the German Krupp empire, oil in Syria, iron ore development in Brazil, a search for new minerals in Nova Scotia.

Reversals and accomplishments in just a part of the long Eaton career would seem enough for the ordinary man. But he never tires of fresh investigations. In recent months, he has been interested in trade between the U.S. and the countries behind the Iron Curtain. His son, Cyrus S. Eaton, Jr., is directing a move to build hotels, in cooperation with Pan American World Airways, in Budapest, Belgrade, Prague, Bucharest, and Warsaw. But the older Eaton's push is plainly discernible.

"Indeed, we must trade with the Soviet Union and with these other nations. And we must trade with China," he says. "People say, if you trade with them, you strengthen them against us. I'm not worried to see Russia prosper. Or China prosper. I feel most people are less likely to engage in fighting if they have the true comforts and the needs they want. The sooner we start trading with Russia and China, the better."

Some time ago, Mr. Eaton attacked J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, ridiculing his hunt for Communists, and at one time the House Un-American Activities Committee nipped at his heels with a subpoena, but it was never served.

Despite all the controversy—Democrats have been wary of the Eatons (Anne Eaton once was spoken of as a candidate for the U.S. Senate) and Republicans have been their target—the financier continues to sail smoothly on, managing his complex business affairs and in the evenings, enjoying his library, heavy with books, at his 171-year-old white frame farmhouse on Acadia Farms.

His estate is 850 rolling acres at Northfield, on Cleveland's eastern edge. There, walking among the tall evergreens or surveying his sleek cattle, the philosopher of Acadia often chats with friends—he likes to show them a troika Nikita Khrushchev once gave him—or pursues grave questions with illustrious guests such as Sir Charles Darwin, grandson of the famed naturalist, or Sir Julian Huxley, the English scientist.

He especially delights in discussing literature and poetry. "I have a hundred favorites in poetry," he has said. "They vary from week to week. Today it might be Keats. Tomorrow it might be Matthew Arnold. Day after, it might be Thomas Gray."

"You know, nothing contributes more to one's happiness in life than reading the great poetry that very often expresses the happiest and best moments in the life of the people who wrote it. I keep the Oxford Book of English Verse by my bed and I read something before going to sleep." He calls reading his "intellectual recreation."

Not long ago, in conversation with a newspaperman, Mr. Eaton seemed to be recalling all those years of commerce and controversy, those first few million dollars he told his father about, and the later years of concern

about Russia and a nuclear war, and he said:

"With my record, I find the notion that I might be a Communist rather astonishing. The honor and highest interests of my country have never for a moment been absent from my heart and my mind. I just have not been able to accept the narrow ideology that capitalism represents every virtue and that communism is an absolute evil."

He paused a moment, and then he added: "No man is more devoted to America than I am. I have a big stake in it." Then he quoted Matthew 6: 21: "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Then Cyrus Eaton remembered Spinoza, and he said: "No fears, no regrets."

WHAT ABOUT CREDIBILITY?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in his statement prepared for the Foreign Relations Committee hearing this morning, Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, stated that the public affairs policy of the Department is based on two principles. One of these, he said, is—conditioned first upon safeguarding information of value to the enemy—"the provision of the maximum amount of truthful information to the people of the United States, whether it be sought by news people or not."

This is a laudable objective. In a free democracy, freedom of access to the facts, to the truth, about the operations of our Government is a vital principle. Nor does it matter whether the truth involved concerns what we ought to know about budget plans or escalation plans. We ought to expect the truth, not that we will be deceived, and particularly not that we will be deceived as a matter of policy. Yet there have in recent months been many indications that make the American public suspicious that this has occurred. It is for that reason that the term "credibility gap" has been gaining currency.

It is my hope that Mr. Sylvester was able to make a completely credible rebuttal of the attitudes attributed to him in the now famous article by correspondent Morley Safer, "Television Covers the War," which appeared in the Overseas Press Club annual publication, Dateline 1966, earlier this year. It was Mr. Safer, of CBS who filmed a year ago the burning of a Vietnamese village, an incident whose television showing made a great impact on the viewing public.

My first acquaintance with Mr. Safer's account of the Saigon encounter between Mr. Sylvester and a group of correspondents came from the respected magazine, Christianity and Crisis, which published in its June 27 edition the shocking report which quoted Mr. Sylvester as saying:

Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that?—stupid.

Reporter Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune reported the Safer story in that paper, in which he included this statement:

Sylvester was asked to write an article for the issue of Dateline in which Safer's report appeared. He was asked a series of questions about the government and truth, which he chose not to answer.

So, in the interest of clarifying whether our policy is actually what Mr. Sylvester has now told the Foreign Relations Committee formally that it is—the "maximum amount" of truthful information—or whether there is room to believe that at least unofficially this may be considered stupid, I sincerely hope that the committee's questions and his answers have provided some enlightenment. Certainly without the most definite refutation, which so far as I know has never been given heretofore, Mr. Safer's charges are most damaging, particularly since he concludes with reference to personal pressures, including a statement to his boss that he is married to an Asian and therefore presumably biased when in fact he is not married at all. He also said:

The pressure can take less subtle forms: "Unless you get Safer out of there he's liable to end up with a bullet in his back."

On August 15 Senator FULBRIGHT inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Murray Marder, who is diplomatic correspondent for the Washington Post, an article which appeared in the Progressive for August under the title "Our Crumbling Credibility." Mr. Marder puts the basic question in admirable form when he says:

The degree of belief, doubt, or disbelief accorded to the words and actions of a nation is akin to the susceptibilities of a credit rating. Once impaired, there is the devil to pay to make it whole again. That is the international risk that has been run beyond the domestic discord over morality, ethics, and politics by what has become known as the U.S. "credibility gap."

There is no denying that there is indeed a credibility gap. It is not diminished when the press reports that a nurse at a university at which the President is to receive an honorary degree is approached by someone supposedly in an official capacity, to request that she get up and accompany to the exit a professor who has announced his intention to walk out during the ceremony—an action which would act out the untruth that he is ill rather than protesting Vietnam policy.

Nor is it diminished when the news reports such events as those surrounding the "backgrounder" in Saigon out of which reliable newsmen, including Ward Just of the Washington Post and Associated Press reporters, revealed studies on the future duration and force size there. Perhaps in that case there was no outright lie being told, but the attempt to camouflage the truth is scarcely less reprehensible. The Washington Post correspondent, who has for a long time proven himself a conscientious and often even brilliant reporter, said that "according to a study conducted by the Department of Defense" the war would last at least 8 years at present force levels, and 5 years if our troops go to 750,000. The Associated Press said one study was by the Marine Corps, another by the Army. Here is the statement on this issued by Mr. Sylvester, or if not by him personally, the statement issued by the Public Affairs Office of which he is the head.

The Defense Department said today that it does not have any study which predicts that the war in Vietnam will last another eight years if continued at the present pace with current force levels. The Joint Chiefs of Staff do not have any such study.

Neither the Department of Defense nor the Joint Chiefs has any study which indicates that the war would last at least five years with 750,000 American troops in the field.

Now, I do not believe that the responsible reporters on the scene completely fabricated such reports. Nor do I believe that the statement of the Public Affairs Office is completely candid. When it says the Defense Department "does not have" a study, it is worth noting that the words are not the flat denial that there is any such study in existence which was the first Pentagon response. Time after time we find a sort of "weasel-ing" even when there is no practice of a maxim that to tell the truth is stupid.

James Reston spoke of the credibility problem in a New York Times dispatch on July 1. He ticked off some of the reasons why the present administration "will probably never regain the confidence it has lost in its judgment and veracity." What were some of those reasons?

Mainly, the dispatch was inspired by the fact that we had then just bombed targets on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong for the first time.

With that accomplishment—

Mr. Reston said—

the administration has now done almost everything it said or indicated it would not do except bomb China, and the end of this melancholy chapter in American history is not yet.

Can we believe that there will be no invasion of North Vietnam by our forces? Can we credit the statements that we will not bomb airfields or installations over the North Vietnamese border in China? Or is our escalation headed upward and upward to the point where we will have at the very least hundreds of thousands of our men committed to Southeast Asia for undetermined years, perhaps facing the Chinese in that massive land war we do not want? Or is there even a possibility that the unthinkable will occur, that we will, before this is concluded, use atomic weaponry, perhaps small field use at first, and then going to "preventive action" such as some have advocated against China's growing nuclear ability?

We said we were not going beyond the 17th parallel in Vietnam, but we did go on. We said we were merely going to respond to enemy attacks on our bases, but we went over to the offensive. Time after time we have said one thing and done another. The toll is great both at home and abroad—particularly in other countries.

Others have spoken out on this topic, and unfortunately there will all too probably be occasions again which will call forth remarks on the "credibility gap," to use the phrase first coined by Mr. Marder. It was said long since that "the first casualty of war is truth," and in this undeclared war we have too long had as one of its casualties at least un-

declared truth, if not lies. In the long run, it is the lie, not the truth, which will prove stupid.

AMERICAN LEGION TO ELECT JOHN DAVIS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I wish to salute the American Legion members of the Nation and particularly those from my State of North Dakota during their national convention here.

The American Legion has over 2½ million members dedicated to Americans and Americanism.

Phil Casey, of the Washington Post, wrote of the American Legion:

The Legion is non-partisan . . . led by business and professional men and such men are prominent among its membership.

. . . when the Legion goes to city hall, the governor's mansion, the state legislature, the Congress, or even a president, it is talking to its own. The Legion counts among its members 31 governors, 61 Senators, 270 Representatives, and the President, four Supreme Court Justices and many government officials.

The American Legion has been active in the fight for veterans' benefits, it led the fight for the creation of a Veterans' Administration and was instrumental in the passage of the GI bill.

The strength of the American Legion is in the towns and smaller cities. It is particularly strong in the Midwest.

I am proud that North Dakota has its share of leaders in the American Legion. Jack Williams, of Fargo, acknowledged "dean of Legion department adjutants," is known throughout the Nation's American Legion posts for his service to the organization and to his community. The Jack Williams American Legion baseball field in Fargo is evidence of North Dakota's appreciation of Jack Williams.

Lynn U. Stambaugh, formerly of Fargo and formerly a member of the Export-Import Bank, was the first North Dakotan to attain national office in the Legion as national commander in 1941. Stambaugh is soon to be followed by John Davis, former Governor of North Dakota and candidate for national commander this year.

I know from experience that John is a formidable opponent and a veteran campaigner. Davis is a veteran of World War II, winning the Purple Heart, the Silver Star, and the Bronze Star. He was the first World War II veteran to be named commander of the North Dakota Department of the American Legion. He served as Governor of North Dakota for two terms from 1956 to 1960.

Davis, with his campaign manager Jack Williams and a group of backers including Burt Draeb, Hebron; Elmo Olson, Finley; Art Ulness, John Crary, Gordon La Mont, Ernie Schmit, of Fargo; Art Rulon, Jamestown; Carl Torgerson, Cooperstown; Sam Tolchinsky, Bismarck; Bill Gust, St. Thomas; Paul Lange, Devils Lake; and Frank Kosanda, Grand Forks; are waging a fast-moving campaign that was begun over a year ago. These men and over 250 North Dakota delegates, their wives, and friends, came to Washington for this great convention and have as their sole aim to get

John Davis elected to the post of National Commander of the American Legion, and I think they will do it.

Not only will this organization be honoring a deserving and capable man, but it will for the second time also be honoring the State of North Dakota.

I offer my congratulations to John Davis and extend to him every good wish in his term of office.

GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY HEW NOT IN CONFORMITY WITH CONSTITUTION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, some years ago a novel appeared on the market entitled "1984" written by George Orwell. This book portrayed an enslaved society controlled by a central power using mass communications and psychological brainwashing to keep the citizens subjugated.

At the time I read this book I dismissed the possibility that such a thing could come into existence in the United States. I reasoned that the Constitution and the Americans' love for independence and justice would never permit the Government to become so powerful that it could literally submerge the population under its tyrannical will.

Mr. President, today I do not regard the book "1984" in the same light. In this year 1966 we are only a scant few years away not only from the date 1984, but from the type of society Orwell described.

Across the Nation students have started school and these schools which have been the foundation of our free and democratic way of life are being subjugated by the Central Government.

Last spring the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, acting completely contrary to the civil rights laws, decided to impose a racial balance in the schools. They did this by issuing guidelines which they claimed were to guarantee that segregation would not occur in the schools.

The year before most schools submitted desegregation plans usually based on the time-honored American system of freedom of choice and these plans were approved.

But this was not good enough for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because by issuing the infamous 441B compliance request, they said in effect that unless a certain percentage of students exercised their freedom of choice in order to obtain a racial balance, then the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would step in and arbitrarily assign students.

If this is not controlled, both bureaucratic and tyrannical, I do not know what control is.

The goad being used by HEW is the withholding of the taxpayer's own money which he has gladly given for the support of his schools. The denying of funds which belong to the people is the mark of a dictatorship.

If HEW's philosophy is allowed to expand, I see a grim future.

Mr. President, what is to keep the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare from deciding that to guarantee that all students receive equal instructions they should require that schools hire only teachers holding specific approval by HEW? In this manner HEW could guarantee that only teachers that had submerged their individuality and their particular talents to the doctrines and rules of HEW could be permitted to teach in our schools. It should be fairly obvious that political patronage could not possibly be separated from such teacher accreditation.

In order to achieve so-called equality in education, is it not logical that HEW should insist that all textbooks be submitted for their approval? Of course, only textbooks carrying the proper bureaucratic line would be approved, and to make sure that they were not contaminated, it is even more probable that HEW would insist on printing them at some huge Government schoolbook printing plant. Employment in this printing plant would further the bureaucratic monster.

In Washington, D.C., television teaching has progressed beyond the experimental stages and I have no doubt in my mind that when HEW takes over the curriculum of the Nation's schools they will withhold funds from any school that does not place a television receiver in each classroom and which does not carry an HEW produced, directed and controlled course of lectures to be seen on this television set.

Could anything be more injurious to the individual vitality of the student than such an utter sameness and such overwhelming technical brainwashing?

Each time a school should decline to comply they would be threatened with the loss of the taxpayers' support controlled by the omnipotent HEW.

Mr. President, these schools would not even have the right to bring suit in court, because HEW has discovered already that there is an easy method of denying the relief of the courts to these plaintiffs.

There is a well-known legal principle that the courts may hold that a plaintiff must exhaust all administrative channels before turning to the judiciary.

HEW, with its complex maze of bureaucratic channels, can require a plaintiff to pursue such administrative relief for years before he would be qualified to say he had exhausted these so-called channels of administrative relief.

Mr. President, this grim picture is not a case of providing freedom of choice to all students, or even a quality of opportunity, but instead what we have before us today is the rapidly growing tyranny of Federal bureaucracy which is feasting on the illusions of the people.

It would be a great pity if the citizens of this Nation should awaken in 1984 to find that they had at last received equality, but that equality was the same-ness of slavery.

HEW, in ignoring the law, has sought to protect its practice either from the actions of Congress, or from the courts. The civil rights law of 1964 specifically prohibits the assigning of students to achieve a racial balance. Because HEW has ignored this mandate, it would ap-

pear relief could be obtained from the courts.

However, by concocting the 441B guidelines and requesting signed compliance, HEW is in effect making contracts between each school and the Government agency. These contracts are like blank checks to HEW and they allow an extensive amount of manipulation of our schools by this Government agency.

There is a well-known practice of swindlers to sell a homeowner on the idea of remodeling or improving his home. The swindler then gets the homeowner to sign his name on a contract which the property owner believes is a sort of conditional sales contract calling for the promised work to be done in exchange for a set price.

What the swindled homeowner finds out is that he has signed a second mortgage or a lien agreeing to pay back a loan. The loan, of course, has been given to the contractor who is not legally required to provide any services.

These homeowners have found in court that the promissory notes they have signed must be paid and there is no way they can force the swindler to make good his unwitnessed verbal contract.

Agents of HEW have been visiting schools and talking with school boards. These agents have made many promises, but nowhere do these promises appear in writing and the school board in the end is faced with signing a contract guaranteeing compliance.

The homeowner who was swindled and the school boards who have allowed themselves to be wooed are both in the same boat, the only difference being an agency of the U.S. Government is involved with the school boards. I have received continuing reports from school boards who signed 441B in good faith, but who have found that this has not satisfied the ambitions of HEW.

Mr. President, many of these school boards had approved plans of desegregation a year ago and without warning, these plans were suddenly declared void by HEW. Now many of these school boards have signed 441B, but what guarantee is there that in a month or two this will be declared void and there will be a new compliance or a new form to sign? The answer is there is no guarantee and I suspect that is exactly what will happen.

Mr. President, we are not without the power to stop this frightening trend. HEW has clearly defied the law and Congress, and it is our sacred obligation to the Constitution and the citizens to do something about it.

COPING WITH COLLEGE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, thousands of young people will enter college for the first time this fall. What will they do with the 4 years ahead?

Many are prepared to deal with the new experiences that await them. These students will make the adjustments that must be made if they are to meet successfully the challenges presented by an institution of higher learning. These students will grow along the way.

Others, however, will not have the maturity, persistence, and sense of humor required for them to take college in their stride. In fact, half of the students entering college do not complete their work for an undergraduate degree. They become college dropouts.

Stanley J. Idzerda, dean of the college, Wesleyan University, has written a series of articles for Newspaper Enterprise Association. In these articles, Dean Idzerda—an educator who has coped with college students and their problems for many years—offers meaningful insights and sound advice to the young person about to embark on a college career.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles, entitled "Coping With College," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the series was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPING WITH COLLEGE—MEMO TO THE CAMPUS-BOUND

(By Stanley J. Idzerda, dean of the college, Wesleyan University)
(First in a series)

Well, you've made it. A college has accepted you.

A year or more of strain, tests and intensive body English has paid off. Now, you're campus-bound.

It may seem unfair, but it will be wise to jolt your feeling of euphoria right now.

Your problems have only begun. You have four years in which to make a success of your college experience—and it won't be easy.

Fully 50 per cent of incoming freshmen find it so difficult that they drop out before graduation. Keep in mind that all of them have the intellectual potential for the job; otherwise they would never have been admitted to college.

To succeed in any job, it is well to understand what the job is and why it needs to be done. What is the purpose of investing four years in college?

Too many incoming college students have a very inadequate idea of why they are there or what they are to do. As a result of this confusion, they fail.

Others fail to obtain an education even though they complete four years and have a diploma to document the time invested. They have gone through the motions, but have avoided the real college experience.

Here is a checklist of things that a college education is not:

College is not merely the "thing to do." If you want to do an "in" thing, take up polo. It would be cheaper and it would not involve any of the self-deception entailed in fending off education.

College is not a passport to upper-middle class suburbia. Students—egged on by parents—who see education in terms of prestige and status, are misled. The "prestige" of a college graduate will never match the value of true college education.

Nor, to tighten the focus, is a college education merely a process of advanced vocational training. Anyone who goes to college solely to be accredited as a doctor, lawyer, or business chief has missed the essential point of the whole experience.

I also take the view that four years of college is not merely fun and games. Most students are all too resourceful in availing themselves of social possibilities of college life. (More power to them.) But the fun is not to be confused with the real function of education.

Just what is the real function of education? To me, the great purpose of a college

education is fulfilling our species' billing—that we are homo sapiens, thinking men.

Philosopher—and college professor—Henri Bergson once suggested that everyone should begin with a simple and noble purpose, to know everything. That is the perfect objective for a college student.

College should stretch the mind and spirit. The four years should serve as a laboratory for self-discovery. Guided by the discoveries—and blind alleys—of science and our humanistic tradition, each student should chip thousands of new facets on himself.

The student may come out of the four years with at least preliminary training to be a doctor or an engineer. But, more to the point, he will also have taken long steps toward being a fully realized adult.

But merely urging intellectual stimulation and growth is not very specific. What should we study? Every student's education, I believe, should be built around four questions:

1. What is God? By 17 or 18, it is time that a student realize that man has always sought some relationship with the Other. Consideration of theology will have no direct effect in making the student more moral. But the study of the nature and attributes of what men have called God will be a path to wisdom.

2. What is man? What am I? What is my fellow man—in Tierra del Fuego, in Japan or down the street? These questions include all the social sciences, the life sciences and philosophy.

3. What is nature? The disciplines involved in this study are all the sciences, physical and biological, experimental and theoretical.

4. What are the relationships of God, man and nature?

Ascribing overriding importance to these questions may seem a trifle solemn. It really shouldn't. Attainment of our potential should actually be a great joy—beyond pleasure.

Aristotle said that the desire for wisdom began with "wonder." He was only half right. The long term pursuit of wisdom also ends with wonder. Learning in college how to pursue wisdom opens a life full of wonder. And is the only kind worth living.

ORGANIZING THAT NEW LIFE AWAY FROM HOME (By Stanley J. Idzerda) (Second of a series)

One of the most significant aspects of a college education is that it very often means a change of scene for the student. The old neighborhood and the old gang are gone.

Direct reliance upon—or rebellion against—mother and dad are no longer possible.

This is a consummation long and devoutly hoped by most high school students. Getting away seems to represent a breakthrough into life.

But many young men and women begin to have second thoughts as they near time to leave. Having impatiently awaited the adult status of a college student, they tend to hold back as time grows short. They worry about "the unknown."

Once arrived on campus, they are relieved by the appearance of old friends who have come to the same college. Even casual acquaintances assume a new importance.

While the reaction is natural, conditioning against it is wise. A college education presupposes change, challenge, ferment. There certainly is no reason to cling desperately to every scrap of remembered past.

A surprising number of new students come down with full-fledged cases of homesickness during the first semester. Brothers and sisters are, suddenly, remembered as being quite human. There is even some appreciation of parents.

No matter how they aspired to get away while back in high school, some freshmen discover a homing instinct. If distances and

finances make it at all practical, they make a direct line for home every weekend.

It is not necessarily a good idea. Dashing back every weekend weakens the commitment and immersion the student should feel in his new life at college. A good rule is to stay on campus during the fall of freshman year at least until Thanksgiving.

The material requirements for making a go of campus life are not high. As the new student prepares to head for college, he should plan to "travel light." There is no need to bring an entire wardrobe and all books, records and athletic equipment.

Having this well-loved gear at hand may have a tranquilizing effect. But it really is not needed. Dress on most campuses is extremely informal.

A second general rule is: "Live inexpensively." College students are not generally impressed by the big spender. Certainly their friendship is not bought.

Many students have no choice but to "live inexpensively." At least 25 per cent of all college students must work 10 or more hours a week to keep up with their expenses. They have neither the time, the inclination nor the resources for the local equivalent of the vita dolce.

Work, on the current campus scene, is customary and fully accepted. There is no stigma connected with taking, say, a job in the college bursar's office or going to work in town.

A third general principle is: "Be tolerant." This should guide the new student in his relations with all those with whom he has contact. An inability or unwillingness to understand or ride along with minor foibles encountered among students or faculty can only make adapting to the college environment more difficult.

Tolerance is most important in dealing with the new individual with whom you share the toothbrush rack, your roommate. The simple facts are that living and collaborating with one another require mutual consideration, mutual regard and mutual support.

The experience of getting along with a roommate is of genuine importance. It enlarges the student's capacity not only to see another person's point-of-view, but to learn from and even share some of it.

One problem that can be intensified by new surroundings is illness. It is no fun to be sick under the best of circumstances. Being sick and stuck in a college infirmary is a good deal worse. Perhaps it's the time a full appreciation of parents is realized. But this is conditioning for life, too.

Unwillingness to subject themselves to "the unknown" of the infirmary prompts some freshmen to try to shrug off illnesses that should be treated. Colds, flu and other "bugs" are all too communicable on a college campus. The physician in the college infirmary is right to ask that students report when they are sick.

All in all, the college will probably be a very different experience for the new student. He will not have his parents to fall back upon, nor can he reassure himself with the familiarity of home and childhood friends.

The personal setting for his academic work—the reason that he came to college—will involve working with new people, depending upon new friends. Above all else, the premium will be on self-reliance.

WANT TO BE A SUCCESSFUL STUDENT?

(By Stanley J. Idzerda)

(Third of a series)

When you get to college, will you be a student or a pupil?

Many will not give up the pupil's approach. In primary and secondary school they learned how to rack up points by diligently memorizing textbook material and mimicking opinions of teachers.

That formula should be unlearned before the newcomer arrives on his campus.

On the university level the premium is on students. The concept of higher education is entirely geared to adults—students and faculty interacting. Students search for the truth, constantly testing ideas and synthesizing new information. Pupils parrot what they are told. They never dig below the surface.

Initiative is an outstanding characteristic of the successful college student. It is up to him, after all. He must go after a subject, probe for its problems and hypothesize answers.

If the going becomes sticky, initiative will again pay off. It is the college student's responsibility to seek out the assistance of his instructor.

That contrasts with the situation in high school. There the teacher is obliged to check with and help pupils who are lagging behind.

There should be no doubt. College instructors are usually glad to help. They will offer special assistance regarding the content of a course or suggestions as to improve study procedures.

But the first step must be taken by the student who is having trouble.

Initiative also importantly figures in the process of freshman placement. The new student should be ready the day he steps foot on campus. The action begins immediately.

The battery of aptitude and placement tests that confront incoming freshmen are important. The tests gauge the strengths and weaknesses of all new students and help college officials place them in the right courses.

Placement in the right section of the right course is equally important. Beginning courses take into account the varying aptitudes of freshmen and are often divided into "honors" and "regular" sections.

High scores on the aptitude and placement tests may permit an incoming student to enter an advanced class. Normally first semester courses for freshmen are given over to intensive reviews of English, foreign languages, physical science and other basic subjects.

Because the stakes are high, an incoming student should polish his skills during the late summer. After a summer of fun or work, one's intellectual edge may not be too sharp. The resulting danger is that with a mediocre score on a placement test, the new student will find himself set on a lower rung than he really deserves.

Then—mid-October—"It all comes back." Too late.

The new student is stuck for a semester of freshman review. Nonetheless, it is not genuinely productive to begin the ferment of a college education by plodding through something that you already know. Advance prep for the placement tests is the answer.

Some new students prefer to think that there is always room at the bottom. They aim low. Lacking confidence in the advanced work they did in high school, they insist upon the lowest possible placement so as to minimize competition and avoid failure. Boredom also strikes most of these students eventually.

Initiative also pays off on a day-to-day, hour-by-hour basis. The ability to get to work—and stay at work—is the ultimate key to college success.

Many students refuse to acknowledge this need. Most have more than enough capacity to handle the intellectual burden, but very few ever gear themselves to anything near their capacity.

The brighter ones are often most at fault. They have become accustomed to getting by in high school and never care to mend their ways. The number of first-class minds that emerge from college with a so-so education is appalling.

Achievement almost always requires periods of loneliness and drudgery. That is true in college and throughout life.

Time-wasting is the greatest vice in college life. And time is our most precious possession.

To help control your use of time, set up a schedule. Draw a grid with seven columns for the days and with spaces for each 24 hours.

First, mark off eight hours a day for sleep. We can't get by with much less. Eating and grooming probably account for about four hours a day.

For study, a rough measure is that a student should spend two hours for study outside class for every semester hour of credit. If a typical program involves 15 hours of class every week, that means a total of 45 for class and study. It would probably be right to add five hours for laboratory work.

Extra-curricular activities are an extremely important element of college and should be given at least 14 hours a week. Add 10 for a paying job and you have a total of 158 hours. Ten are left for worship, dating, contemplation—and just plain loafing.

Stultifying? Too unimaginative? Perhaps. But if you succeed in organizing your time, you are well on your way toward success as a college student.

DISCOVERING A NEW LIFE AND PERSONALITY

(By Stanley J. Idzerda)

(Fourth of a series)

The wraps are off. The newly arrived college student is free. He calls his own shots and, within the mildest constraints, does as he wants.

This is an abrupt change from life as a high school pupil. At that level, parents and teachers effectively mold a youngster's life and behavior. Even rebels have a definite set of dos and don'ts at which to kick their heels.

In the new, free environment of college, some students "completely change." At the extreme, a good high school pupil may become a lackadaisical college student. Or he may become all wrapped up in one subject, one issue or one person and lose out on the breadth of experience and training that college should provide.

Under the best of circumstances, the new student will find himself modifying and strengthening his personality. He is an adult now. An adolescent's manner is no longer suitable. College is necessarily a period of profound personality change.

Too many merely react to a lack of parental supervision—in such areas as neatness, grooming, table manners, smoking, drinking and sex. Such reactions may be inevitable. But they are nothing more than reactions. The greatest danger is that the student will kid himself into thinking that his new (often bad) manners really represent a step toward maturity.

Fortunately, not too many college students overestimate the significance of a pair of jackboots, an unkempt haircut or whatever else might be "in" at the moment. For one thing, in this precocious age, many of these affectations are now the domain of high school pupils. It is they who are now the pace setters in youth fads. College students are recognized to be "older"—and very often more serious-minded.

But college students in groping to find a new personality often do overcommit themselves to various aspects of their campus environments. Some place all their emphasis upon being accepted by a fraternity or sorority. This is a shortcut to finding a new life style.

Once accepted, some students compress themselves in what they believe to be their fraternity's mold. Conformity of this sort is the hang-up of many people beginning college.

Admission to a fraternity or sorority can be a problem in another sense. Nothing is sadder than the freshman who defines the entire meaning of his college life as admission to a specific fraternity—and then does not receive a bid to it.

He has simply misunderstood the central meaning of college. Moreover, the student despondent about not having made a fraternity should know that as a sophomore with a "B" average and some sign of leadership, he will be a welcome entrant in most Greek letter societies.

The key point on fraternities and sororities, I believe, is that incoming students should carefully consider the fraternities on the campus. It is important to obtain complete information on the physical, social and intellectual values—and disvalues—of a fraternity before committing oneself to it.

Campus politics can become obsessive, too. Becoming a class officer or taking a position in clubs or organizations can be very worthwhile. Some campus politicians become so frenzied, however, that they no longer have time for academic work, roommates or the cultural life outside classes.

Nor does activism necessarily insure effectiveness or significance. Again, as with choices of social groups, entry into clubs and political activity should be made with real care.

Varsity sports also attract some students. But for the high school pupil who found his greatest fulfillment in varsity competition, college can prove a major disappointment. Making a college basketball or football team can be very difficult. "Good" skills often are not enough.

One of the pleasant discoveries of college life is that intramural sports are much more important than at high school. One can engage in intramural sport of one kind or another all year. It is usually a major factor in the social life of a dormitory or fraternity. Also, students who participate in intramural sports find they have an enhanced sense of physical well-being, to say nothing of increased self-confidence.

In a sense, over-commitment to study can also defeat the purpose of college. The "grind" is a caricature of a real student.

This is not to dispute that the classroom, laboratory, library and one's own study desk are the centers of college life. They are properly so. Furthermore, a capacity for solitary intellectual drudgery should be developed.

But the grind puts the wrong kind of a premium on grades. And the grind is wrong in cultivating isolation. The fact is we learn together: intellectual growth usually stems from dialogue. Moreover, the grind wrongly deprives himself when he cuts off social opportunities and remorselessly sticks to his books.

Giving your "all"—whether to sports, campus politics or anything else—is an easy approach. But it does not accord with the real values of college. Higher education aims at developing people who are multifaceted—not one-track.

WHAT ABOUT CAMPUS BEATNIKS AND ACTIVISTS?

(By Stanley J. Idzerda)

(Fifth in a series)

The freedom, openness and relative ambiguity one faces in college is a shock and that shock derives from the very thing that most college students most seek—independence.

The first shock of independence often occurs with the realization that the college faculty is making some large, generous assumptions about the new student's maturity. For example, the professor addresses his first session of a freshman class: "Ladies and gentlemen, this morning we shall examine..."

The salutation was not "Boys and girls!" Self-conscious smiles light the classroom.

But the professor's opening words are also significant in other senses, too. He says, "we." Learning is to be a common, shared enterprise. And information is to be "examined." Mere absorption of assigned material is past. Now the student is encouraged to develop a critical capacity and to exercise it constantly.

All of which means that the college student has adulthood thrust upon him. He must take the initiative. It is no longer a matter of wishing for independence. He has it and must endure its consequences.

To some students, adulthood is not merely a shock; it is shattering. They give up all standards. Purporting to seek greater creativity, these young people expunge all norms. Pattern, design, form and explicit goals are all held to be hindrances in the free play of one's personality.

In the expression of their new independence, these students conclude that standards set by anyone—except those in rebellion against standards—wrongfully inhibit their free growth and their potential for feeling, insight and inspiration.

While it may be unfair, students of this sort are usually labeled as "beatniks." Pure specimens of the species are not found on many campuses, but hybrids abound.

Unhappily, these normless "creator" types seem to think that their outlook is necessary for any artistic achievement. They ignore the plain fact that measure, form and values are essential in art—as well as all other human achievement.

"Beatniks," real and fancied, have been a boon to those prone to find fault with campus life. But if it were not for that, it would be something else.

To those 20 or more years their senior, the college generation never has quite the proper stance. Either it is too undisciplined, too sober, too apathetic, too activist, too sex-mad, too bookish—or too something.

In the recent past, the critics despaired of the "silent" or "apathetic generation." Now the tide has turned. The minority on present-day campuses that makes the news and sets the pace is politically activist. Student action on political and social causes is almost daily headline fare.

As a result, there is now as much worry about and criticism of the "committed generation" as there was about the "silent generation" that preceded it.

In some people's minds there is confusion between the activists and the beatniks. To be sure, some activists are also distinguished by beards and flowing manes. The nonconformist uniform is largely the same.

But beatniks are really apolitical. They say they want to withdraw from society. The activists want to transform it—and fast.

Actually, to keep our fads straight, beatniks are not quite contemporary. For "today" people, activism is the mode. The "beats" really belong to the yesterday of the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Today's campus activism obviously reflects the temper and tone of the society from which the students come. The all-important additive is the elan and capacity for single-minded intensity that is so characteristic of college-age people. Whether it's a matter of backing a football team or demanding civic reform, students have "spirit."

The question is: Does political activism fit in college life?

Some argue that a college is a separate and special community withdrawn from the larger community. As such, college students should not participate in the life of the larger community. In short, college is an ivory tower. Intellectual activity is on an abstract, hypothetical level. All is essentially a form of exercise preparing the student for existence after college.

The contrasting viewpoint holds that college is a laboratory for self-discovery. This cannot be done in isolation or a social vac-

uum. The evolution of one's values is only possible in the context of real problems. The essential validity of the second proposition seems self-evident to me. Our intellects are not disembodied. Every subject we study has some significance to the world around us.

Going to college is, of course, a formalized means of seeking the truth—as ivory tower advocates would maintain. But contemporary students believe that they must also live the truth and do the truth in order to test its total validity.

Nearly all college faculty and administrators prefer the activist student, heavily engaged in political and social causes, to his apathetic, disengaged counterpart. Many students have discovered relevance and meaning to their existence in their commitment to causes.

But balance is necessary. Activism for its own sake can become a vice. A college student, after all, by virtue of his calling should make a commitment based only on reason and reflection.

Nor should a commitment become so obsessive that it obliterates everything else. A student's first job is study. Attending a rally, carrying a banner, immersing oneself in the passions of a mass movement can be one more highly attractive form of procrastination by which a student puts off the hard work of learning.

THE CAMPUS MATING GAME

(By Stanley J. Idzerda)

(Sixth in a series)

No other age has probably been as sexually aware or stimulated. Sex is a major if not overpowering theme of most entertainment and energizes a great part of the nation's advertising and merchandising.

The public is bombarded with sexually provocative images 24 hours a day. In fact, because of the need to build future markets, college students are a key target of the advertising industry.

The impact upon students can be substantial. Try to think of a group more biochemically supercharged. It is amazing that any studying at all is done on campus.

The problem is more acute than it was. Contemporary attitudes toward sex, while perhaps not radically different than those of the immediate postwar period, are certainly now much more permissive. Books, films, even home-consumption television are explicit. Young people, as never before, are being provoked.

Indeed, if this emphasis is continued and further intensified, it is possible that mass media will score an unexpected breakthrough and make sex boring.

As a result, many believe that society affirms the pseudo-psychological theory that sex is at the center of a person's existence. After all, the mass media say that the key goals of life are to be sexually attractive and competent.

The blare of sex propaganda creates an obviously frustrating situation. Sex is merchandised for fun and personal fulfillment by the mass media. But at college students find strong efforts made to deny them intensive sexual expression outside marriage.

On campus, the double standard typically applies. Women usually have "dormitory hours," but men do not. The assumption seems to be that women need more protection. In any case, it is thought, if the girls have to be behind locked doors by midnight, the men will go home.

In face of conflicting standards—restraints vs. provocations—some students contend that their own sex life is their own business. If they want to engage in sex on an experimental basis, they argue, it is their own affair and nobody can say them nay. Even more rationalized premarital relations for engaged couples.

Despite those who advocate or condone promiscuity, the plain truth is that sex is never a private affair. It cannot be rationalized as such. The sex act involves two.

It is sometimes difficult for the college teacher to maintain traditional moral standards. Students come to college to develop their individuality. The only medium in which they can do so is freedom. But it is necessary to ask them to be responsible—and to accept responsibility for physical and emotional consequences of what they do. College students should be made aware that there are serious philosophical and spiritual aspects of sexual activity.

The most important is that a person must be concerned with the effects of his actions upon others.

To use other people for economic or political purposes is considered wrong. That is exploitation. How much worse is sexual exploitation!

Of course, much of the sexual activity among students is entirely correct. They are married. A supposedly transient feature of college life immediately after World War II, married students are now a fixture of most campuses.

Modern undergraduates are very marriage-minded. The canard that only women are looking for a husband is unfounded. Men are also anxious to find a wife.

The motivation of the campus brides and grooms is often very inadequate. In many cases, marriages are based on sex attraction alone. Divorce data makes clear how disastrous that can be.

Immediately allied, romantic love bedazzles many. This rapturous emotion is not proved to be in itself enough to preserve marriage.

Other students have become hopelessly bored with college and see marriage as a means of magically transforming their lives.

In fairness, it should be conceded that records prove that most married college students perform somewhat better than their single classmates. After all, the energy previously given to the chase is now available to study.

Nonetheless, the fact is that most college faculty members urge students to defer marriage until after graduation. Academic life is demanding and fulfilling enough to take up the serious portion of a young person's life.

By and large, students still seem to agree. While most Americans are marrying at steadily younger ages, college students as a group remain apart, postponing marriage until their early 20s.

DOES ANYBODY REALLY CARE ABOUT YOUR GRADES?

(By Stanley J. Idzerda)

(Last in a series)

Among the most widespread and persistent myths shared by college students is that wit, charm, the social graces, and a record of campus activities will be more important to the first employer after college than any other single fact—especially, mere grades.

A closely related myth suggests there is a significant connection between the specific courses we take in college and the employment for which we are qualified.

Facts explode both of these myths.

The most concrete information we have relating to college achievement and performance outside of college is the now famous Bell Telephone Study of 1962. Bell examined the careers of 17,000 of its employees who were college graduates. Success with the company was checked against the employees' academic performance, extra-curricular activities, self-support in college, as well as to the quality of colleges they attended.

Academic excellence closely correlated to success with Bell Telephone. Those who had ranked high in their classes were found to be

receiving the highest salaries in the Bell System.

Achievement at Bell and the quality of the college also showed some correlation. In addition, some relationship was shown between extra-curricular achievement and salaries. No correlation was shown between achievement in business and those who worked to support themselves while students.

But, to repeat, the strongest correlation repeatedly appeared between "grades" and success in business.

The unanimity and consistency of results would seem to show that grades do count in terms of post-college achievement, performance and rewards. Not surprisingly, many personnel directors have taken the Bell study into account. They now interview students in the top third of their classes before any others, sometimes to the exclusion of any others.

This does not mean that there is a direct, connected, verifiable and demonstrated line between a B average in college and the specific work a man or woman performs after college.

What it may mean is that the habits of achievement and the capacity to meet the stated goals of an organization are reflected both in the college grades and in business success.

It may mean also that those who succeed in college, or those who have superior grades in college, have mastered perhaps the most important aspect of any life, the ability and the willingness to learn new, strange and perhaps unpalatable material and information. This capacity to learn, this willingness to master and apply new concepts, is what any person needs in our complex world.

Grades may indicate innate ability. But they may also indicate the capacity for drudgery and the willingness to learn. Employers, at the point of graduation, may not so much treasure a student's grades but the habits and attitudes which those grades signify.

If grades do count, do specific skills count even more? It is true that some employers want such skills. For instance, production industries need various professional skills, such as engineering.

Yet we must remember that nearly two-thirds of all college graduates within five years of their graduation are in a field completely different than that for which they thought they were preparing in college. Furthermore, specialized training becomes dated, if not useless, within 10 years after the student is graduated.

This is not to say that any college "major" is equally important or equally well-suited to everyone. What is suggested is that a student is wise to follow his aptitudes and his interests and to excel in those areas. The habit of excelling is more important than the specific major field one takes in college.

Academic excellence presupposes skill and in-depth understanding of what I call the "languages" of learning.

The first of these is literally that—English. Regardless of grades, major, or plans for the future, unless the student has a command of English, the student will be crippled. He will be at a loss to mold his personal existence and shape his own ideas. And, obviously, inability to work in English will hobble a student in dealing with other people and in progressing in a career.

Mastery of English is not something solely achieved in college. But this essential skill surely should mature at a very rapid rate while at college and should be nearing optimum efficiency by time of graduation.

Foreign tongues are also extremely important. Knowledge of French, Russian, Chinese or any other language provides a far deeper knowledge of our own language. Moreover, a real insight into foreign culture

is only possible when one knows the language of that culture.

Then there are nonlinguistic "languages" that the student must master. Statistics and mathematics are clearly indispensable to roles in technology or science. But these "languages" are also essential for social sciences and arts. The humanist who assumes that he can safely ignore math is sadly mistaken—and will be shut off from much of the modern world.

A campus is not the only possible setting for higher education. Actually, if college has any value at all, the student's higher education will continue throughout life.

College's great significance is that it can in a systematic way and in a conducive environment introduce the student to the educational process. Above all else, this means establishing a taste for human excellence. That is the foundation of a real—and continuing—education.

MR. HOWE'S ADVENTURE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Star of today, August 31, 1966, carried an editorial, titled "Mr. Howe's Adventure." At a later date, I expect to have something to say concerning Mr. Howe's "adventure," but, for the present, I will be content in stating that the Star editorial expresses my sentiments on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. HOWE'S ADVENTURE

Harold Howe II, the new U.S. Commissioner of Education, had no sooner assumed that office earlier this year when he disclosed a strong personal antipathy to the concept of neighborhood schools.

Rather than grapple with the hard, practical frustrations of educational deficiencies in American cities, he launched into fanciful visions of panaceas, among them systems of vast "educational parks," each of which would accommodate perhaps 20,000 public school pupils of varying ages, some transported great distances from their homes in order to cut across "all geographic, economic and cultural boundaries." One of Howe's first offerings was federal dollars in the form of grants to cities "adventurous enough to join us" in planning such enterprises.

It reflects no credit whatever on the new District of Columbia school board that its members now have accepted this invitation.

The idea of applying such "parks" as a substitute for Washington's traditional system of neighborhood schools strikes us as nothing but a pipe dream. The sheer enormity of the scheme, in terms of dollars and land requirements, is enough to chill the wildest optimist. The need for new and replacement schools in Washington is urgent. But many, many of the existing structures provide fine new modern facilities. To propose seriously, as has been proposed, that these buildings might be scrapped as schools and converted to some other public use is simply incomprehensible.

In the minds of Howe and others, the educational parks are seen as a means of establishing racial and economic "balance," of moving the children of low-income families, during their classroom hours, out of the ghetto.

In all candor, however, what advantage, educational or otherwise, could accrue to the deprived child, desperately in the need of personal attention, who became only one of 20,000 on a single campus? Education is the process of doing something with an in-

dividual child, in the context of the teacher-pupil relationship. It is not the process of dealing with great masses of children. From the viewpoint of sound education, the theory is not supported by a single demonstrable justification.

The racial mix in the classroom, of which Howe speaks, could not be substantially affected by educational parks in a city with a school population already over 90 percent Negro. In the Washington Metropolitan Area, the goal of a more sensible, reasonable racial balance in the schools will remain an illusion until more Negro families locate in the suburbs, and until more white families with children return to the city.

No doubt we will be told that the proposed educational-park study is after all only a study, and that we need as never before to seek out new, improved techniques of teaching.

Quite so. Innovation and experimentation are essential, within the sound, proven concept of neighborhood schools. The advocates of educational parks are following a will-o'-the-wisp, which should not be allowed to divert attention from the tough job at hand.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees have until midnight tonight to file reports together with individual views, if desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 1, 1966, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 31, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Reynold E. Carlson, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Stephen N. Shulman, of Virginia, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the remainder of the term expiring July 1, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Paul C. Warnke, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Allen M. Shinn, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1968, vice David Statler Black.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Charles F. Luce, of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice John A. Carver, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 31, 1966:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Crawford Young, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U.S.C. 661).

Lt. Col. Frank C. Boerger, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U.S.C. 661).

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Miles S. McKee, of Michigan, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

Thomas S. Francis, of Maryland, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Ivan L. Bennett, Jr., of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

To be members of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

Harry R. Pauley, of West Virginia, for the term expiring July 15, 1970.

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, for the term expiring July 15, 1971.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Sciences Services Administration:

To be captains

Norman E. Taylor
Gerald L. Short
John O. Boyer

To be commanders

James P. Randall
Kelly E. Taggart
Lavon L. Posey
Philip J. Taetz

To be ensigns

William R. Cameron
John P. DeLozier
Roger G. Kraynick
Alan K. Cooper

U.S. AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, FR1613 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Jonathan O. Seaman, O19385, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Stanley R. Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Elvy Benton Roberts, O25781, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Simmons Timothy, O24992, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Wesley Duke, O33373, U.S. Army.

Col. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., O25710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Willard Roper, O33605, U.S. Army.

Col. Edward Thomas Podufaly, O22913, U.S. Army.

Col. Bernard William Rogers, O25867, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr., O26048, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Allen Knowlton, O25436, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albert Ernest Milloy, O35289, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., O53930, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Mahlon Eugene Gates, O24685, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., O24951, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Holroyd Linnell, O24089, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Edward Mathe, O25878, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Logan Irby, O22678, U.S. Army.

Col. Francis Joseph Roberts, O24820, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard McGowan Lee, O35551, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leo Henry Schweiter, O34334, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Ray Lynch, Jr., O34268, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas James Camp, Jr., O24603, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joyce Bailey James, O53547, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jack Jennings Wagstaff, O35585, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Winant Sidle, O33651, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Steward Lawrence McKenney, O23084, U.S. Army.

Col. Walter James Woolwine, O23795, U.S. Army.

Col. William Russell Kraft, Jr., O24726, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Elmer Parker Yates, O23686, U.S. Army.

Col. Arthur Woodrow Kogstad, O36176, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Donnelly Paul Bolton, O24982, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Daniel McLaughlin, O46520, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Fred Cary Allen, O34104, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Mayo, Jr., O22970, U.S. Army.

Col. Theodore Christopher Mataxis, O34035, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., O34044, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry John Muller, Jr., O24508, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Carleton Preer, Jr., O45567, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Mitchell Glasgow, Jr., O25905, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William John Boehmer, O36550, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Smith Coleman, O35710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Chester Herman Johnson, O44273, U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Butner Clay, O24937, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jack Beverly Matthews, O34721, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Morton McDonald Jones, Jr., O23879, U.S. Army.

Col. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., O88351, Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr., O23899, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Champlain Shaw, O33626, U.S. Army.

Col. Linton Sinclair Boatwright, O23968, U.S. Army.

Col. Raymond Patrick Murphy, O24729, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Stephan Lekson, O35837, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Bruce Barton Jones, O34239, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Gray Wheelock III, O25572, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harold Windsor Rice, O24800, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Vasco John Fenili, O25579, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., O23837, U.S. Army.

Col. George Heacock McBride, O47172, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Hugh Anthony Richeson, O34725, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Hurow, O84372, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr., O24219, U.S. Army.

Col. William Oxley Quirey, O39102, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., O24491, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Herbert Batte, O23401, U.S. Army.

Col. Lawrence Vivans Greene, O23872, U.S. Army.

Col. Ross Rowland Condit, Jr., O80061, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edward Connor, O33960, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Marvin Kinzer, O23552, U.S. Army.

Col. John Glenn Appel, O40700, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edmund Louis DuBois, O24265, U.S. Army.

Col. Allan Gardner Pixton, O24137, U.S. Army.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

To be major generals

William K. Jones
Raymond G. Davis
Charles J. Quilter

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

To be brigadier generals

George E. Dooley
Regan Fuller
John R. Chalson
Oscar F. Peatross
Edwin B. Wheeler

James E. Herbold, Jr.
Webb D. Sawyer
Robert P. Keller
Alan J. Armstrong

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

John S. Hayes, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

Miss Carol C. Laise, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Nepal.

Leo G. Cyr, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Duane A. Aamodt, to be colonel, and ending Humphrey K. Hastings, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 2, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Marsene E. Adkisson, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Joseph W. Widhalm, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 2, 1966.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning James J. Cortez, to be colonel, and ending Gundars Zalkaus, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 2, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Arthur L. Wilkins, to be major, and ending Henry J.

Wojciechowski, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 5, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Robert G. Lewis, to be major, and ending Patrick J. Mumma, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 25, 1966.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Sergei F. Pron, to be ensign, and ending Charles S. Huttula, to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and ap-

peared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 22, 1966.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Edward C. Schriber and Hans W. Lindholm, to be first lieutenants, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 16, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Charles B. Armstrong, Jr., to be colonel, and ending Robert Zeugner, to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 22, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Winfree M. Abernathy, to be captain, and ending Robert S. Rix, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 25, 1966.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning A. John Cope, Jr., to be a consular officer of the United States of America, and ending Miss Frances Lee Weinman, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 3, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Labor Day, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, when Labor Day was first celebrated in 1882, and 12 years later when the U.S. Congress declared it a national holiday, the occasion was usually marked by speeches, parades, and picnics of members of labor unions and their families. Over the years it has come to encompass all the people. For many of us it represents the last fling of summer before a new year of school, hard work, and indoor activity.

While it is fortunate that this holiday is shared by all the people and transcends the focus on the workingman per se, we should nonetheless take advantage of this day to pay tribute to the working men and women of this Nation and the unions which have provided them with greater economic and political strength.

By the vigor and the quality of their work, and by their drive, individually and through their unions, to achieve higher wages, better working conditions, and a brighter future for their children, American workingmen have been a primary factor in leading this Nation to the position of economic preeminence it holds today.

Increasingly, American trade unions have fought not just for the welfare of their own members but have favored and worked for social legislation to benefit all Americans.

They have backed more aid to education, medical research, extension of social security, and medicare. They have given strong backing to liberal or progressive candidates for public office, regardless of party.

When we look forward, we see both formidable challenges and great opportunities for organized labor. Millions of American working men and women who do not yet belong to a labor union would benefit from such an association.

In a period of rising prices such as we are now experiencing, the responsibility of labor negotiators at the expiration of

existing contracts assumes particular gravity, considering their responsibilities both to their own members and to the American people as a whole when we look at the growth of the American labor movement from the day, over 80 years ago, when Labor Day was first celebrated, and the important role it has played in American life, we may be confident that it will continue in increasing measure to contribute to the economic growth and social welfare of our country.

Art Wall, Jr.: Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1966

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania is indeed proud of one of its finest professional sportsmen who has recently won the Insurance City Golf Open. Art Wall, Jr., overcame a serious physical handicap to shoot a 72-hole total of 266—18 strokes under par and the lowest 72-hole total on the PGA tour this year.

The victory was all the more brilliant in view of the severe back problem which has plagued the Honesdale, Pa., resident over the past few years. Art's back has at times prevented him from even swinging a golf club, so that he has not always gotten the necessary daily practice which is such an important ingredient of a professional golfer's success.

The key to his recovery was a much needed rest from the travel involved in tournament golf. Wall thus limited his participation to selected tournaments during the past years. Until this problem cropped up, Art had one of golf's brightest futures. Wall's career reached a high point in 1959 when he won the Masters by firing five birdies on the last six holes in one of the most exciting finishes in golf history.

The victory coupled with several others earned for Art the "Golfer of the Year" award. In addition, Art has shot over 30 holes in 1—more than any other golfer in the world.

The victory at Hartford, Conn., was a fitting tribute to Art Wall's fortitude in

overcoming this physical handicap to truly remain one of the outstanding professional golfers in the world. His courage is a fine example for everyone.

Survivor Annuities for Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for payment of survivor annuities to certain students under the Civil Service Retirement Act comparable to those provided by the Social Security Act, and to correct an inequity under the former act. As the present Civil Service Retirement Act is now written, a student receiving a survivor annuity faces loss of benefits if the nonschool interval between school years is greater than 4 months.

I have recently had a case in my own district where this provision caused an unnecessary hardship for the receiver of an annuity. The subject attends an accredited college where the vacation period is less than 2 weeks longer than 4 months, and thus had to enroll in summer school in order to qualify for benefits.

This is particularly unfortunate since this type of vacation arrangement was designed specifically for the purpose of giving students the opportunity to earn some money for their education during the summer. It is to be noted, however, that a student attending the same college and receiving benefits under the Social Security Act and subject to the same length vacation does not face any loss of annuity.

The reason is that the Social Security Act has been interpreted to the effect that attendance any time during a particular month is considered attendance for the whole month.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is patently unfair for the provisions of one act to cause hardship and discrimination against a student, while in another act such provisions do not exist. Also it is obvious that the Civil Service Retirement Act did